arXiv:1208.0757v1 [math.PR] 3 Aug 2012

Second Order BSDEs with Jumps, Part I: Aggregation and Uniqueness

Nabil Kazi-Tani[*] Dylan Possamai[†] Chao Zhou[‡]

August 6, 2012

Abstract

In this paper, we define a notion of second order backward stochastic differential equation with jumps, which generalizes the continuous case considered by Soner, Touzi and Zhang [37]. In order to correctly define these notions, we first have to solve an important issue corresponding to the possibility to aggregate, in the sense of [39] and [10], both the quadratic variation and the jump measure of the canonical process on the Skorohod space $\mathbb{D}$. For this purpose, we extend in this paper the aggregation result obtained in [39] to our context with jumps, the aggregation being valid for a family of probabilty measures obtained as solutions of martingale problems on $\mathbb{D}$. Then, we obtain a representation of the Y component of the solution of a 2BSDEJ as a supremum of solutions of standard backward SDEs with jumps, which, together with some a priori estimates ensures the uniqueness of the solution. The existence and some applications are obtained in our accompanying paper [23].

Key words: Second order backward stochastic differential equation, backward stochastic differential equation with jumps, singular measures, quasi-sure analysis, aggregation

AMS 2000 subject classifications: 60H10, 60H30

---

[*] CMAP, Ecole Polytechnique, Paris, mohamed-nabil.kazi-tani@polytechnique.edu.

[†] CMAP, Ecole Polytechnique, Paris, dylan.possamai@polytechnique.edu.

[‡] CMAP, Ecole Polytechnique, Paris, chao.zhou@polytechnique.edu.

1 Introduction

Motivated by duality methods and maximum principles for optimal stochastic control, Bismut studied in [7] a linear backward stochastic differential equation (BSDE). In their seminal paper [31], Pardoux and Peng generalized such equations to the non-linear Lipschitz case and proved existence and uniqueness results in a Brownian framework. Since then, a lot of attention has been given to BSDEs and their applications, not only in stochastic control, but also in theoretical economics, stochastic differential games and financial mathematics.

Given a filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{0\leq t\leq T}, \mathbb{P})$ generated by an $\mathbb{R}^d$-valued Brownian motion B, solving a BSDE with generator g, and terminal condition ξ consists in finding a pair of progressively measurable processes (Y, Z) such that

$$Y_t = \xi + \int_t^T g(s, Y_s, Z_s)ds - \int_t^T Z_s dB_s,\ \mathbb{P}-a.s,\ t\in[0,T]. \tag{1.1}$$

The process Y we define this way is a possible generalization of the conditional expectation of ξ, since when g is the null function, we have $Y_t = \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}[\xi|\mathcal{F}_t]$, and in that case, Z is the process appearing in the $(\mathcal{F}_t)$-martingale representation property of $\{\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}[\xi|\mathcal{F}_t], t\geq 0\}$. In the case of a filtered probability space generated by both a Brownian motion B and a Poisson random measure μ with compensator ν, the martingale representation for $\{\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}[\xi|\mathcal{F}_t], t\geq 0\}$ becomes

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}[\xi|\mathcal{F}_t] = \int_0^t Z_s dB_s + \int_0^t \int_{\mathbb{R}^d\backslash\{0\}} \psi_s(x)(\mu-\nu)(ds,dx),$$

where ψ is a predictable function.

This leads to the following natural generalization of equation (1.1) to the case with jumps. We will say that (Y, Z, U) is a solution of the BSDE with generator g and terminal condition ξ if for all $t\in[0,T]$, we have $\mathbb{P}-a.s.$

$$Y_t = \xi + \int_t^T g(s, Y_s, Z_s, U_s)ds - \int_t^T Z_s dB_s - \int_t^T \int_{\mathbb{R}^d\backslash\{0\}} U_s(x)(\mu-\nu)(ds,dx). \tag{1.2}$$

Li and Tang [40] were the first to prove existence and uniqueness of a solution for (1.2) in the case where g is Lipschitz in (y, z, u). Our aim in this paper is to generalize (1.2) to the second order, as introduced recently by Soner, Touzi and Zhang [37]. Their key idea in the definition of the second order BSDE is that the equation defining the solution has to hold $\mathbb{P}$-almost surely, for every $\mathbb{P}$ in a class of non dominated probability measures. Furthermore, they prove a uniqueness result using a representation result of the 2BSDEs as essential supremum of standard BSDEs. We will extend these definitions and properties to the case with jumps. For the sake of clarity, we will now briefly outline the main differences and difficulties due to the presence of jumps.

(i) First, we will introduce an equation similar to (1.2), for which the driver g depends also on the quadratic variation of B^c on the one hand, and on the compensator of the jump measure of B^d on the other hand, where B^c and B^d denote respectively the continuous and the purely discontinuous parts of B. Recall that the generator of standard BSDEs does not depend on the quadratic variation of the canonical process, and that in the continuous second order case it only depends on the quadratic variation of the Brownian martingale part. In our case, since we have an additional jump martingale term in the equation, we also have an additional dependence in the driver.

(ii) A second major difference with (1.2) in the second order case, is, as we recalled earlier, that the BSDE has to hold $\mathbb{P}$-almost surely for every probability measure $\mathbb{P}$ lying in a wide family of probability measures. Under each $\mathbb{P}$, B^c and B^d have a prescribed quadratic variation and jump measure compensator. This is why we can intuitively understand the second order BSDE with jumps (2BSDEJ in the sequel) (3.3) as a backward SDE with model uncertainty, where the uncertainty affects both the quadratic variation and the jump measure of the process driving the equation.

(iii) The last major difference with (1.2) in the second order case is the presence of an additional increasing process K in the equation. To have an intuition for K, one has to have in mind the representation (4.1) that we prove in Theorem 4.1, stating that the Y part of a solution of a 2BSDEJ is an essential supremum of solutions of standard backward SDEs with jumps. The process K maintains Y above any standard solution $y^{\mathbb{P}}$ of a BSDE with jumps, with given quadratic variation and jump measure under $\mathbb{P}$. The process K is then formally analogous to the increasing process appearing in reflected BSDEs (as defined in [17] for instance).

There are many other possible approaches in the litterature to handle volatility and / or jump measure uncertainty in stochastic models ([1], [12], [13], [6]). Among them, Peng [32] introduced a notion of Brownian motion with uncertain variance structure, called G-Brownian motion. This process is defined without making reference to a given probability measure. It refers instead to the G-Gaussian law, defined by a partial differential equation (see [33] for a detailed exposition and references).

Finally, recall that Pardoux and Peng [31] proved that if the randomness in g and ξ is induced by the current value of a state process defined by a forward stochastic differential equation, the solution to the BSDE (1.1) could be linked to the solution of a semilinear PDE by means of a generalized Feynman-Kac formula. Similarly, Soner, Touzi and Zhang [37] showed that 2BSDEs generalized the point of view of Pardoux and Peng, in the sense that they are connected to the larger class of fully non linear PDEs. In this context, the 2BSDEJs are the natural candidates for a probabilistic solution of fully non linear integro-differential equations. This is the purpose of our accompanying paper [24].

The rest of this paper is organised as follows. In Section 2, we introduce the set of probability measures on the Skorohod space $\mathbb{D}$ that we will work with. Using the notion of martingale problems on $\mathbb{D}$, we construct probability measures under which the canonical process has given characteristics. Then we prove an aggregation result under this family. In Section 3, we define the notion of 2BSDEJs and show how it is linked to standard BSDEs with jumps. Section 4 is devoted to our uniqueness result and some a priori estimates. The Appendix is dedicated to the proof of some important technical results needed throughout the paper.

2 Issues related to aggregation

2.1 The stochastic basis

Let $\Omega := \mathbb{D}([0,T],\mathbb{R}^d)$ be the space of càdlàg paths defined on $[0,T]$ with values in R^d and such that $w(0)=0$, equipped with the Skorokhod topology, so that it is a complete, separable metric space (see [5] for instance). The uniform norm on Ω is defined by $\|\omega\|_\infty := \sup_{0\leq t\leq T}|\omega_t|$.

We denote B the canonical process, $\mathbb{F} := \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{0\leq t\leq T}$ the filtration generated by B, $\mathbb{F}^+ := \left\{\mathcal{F}_t^+\right\}_{0\leq t\leq T}$ the right limit of $\mathbb{F}$ and for any $\mathbb{P}$, $\overline{\mathcal{F}}_t^{\mathbb{P}} := \mathcal{F}_t^+ \vee \mathcal{N}^{\mathbb{P}}(\mathcal{F}_t^+)$ where

$$\mathcal{N}^{\mathbb{P}}(\mathcal{G}) := \left\{E\in\Omega,\ \text{there exists } \widetilde{E}\in\mathcal{G} \text{ such that } E\subset\widetilde{E} \text{ and } \mathbb{P}(\widetilde{E})=0\right\}.$$

As usual, for any filtration $\mathbb{G}$ and any probability measure $\mathbb{P}$, $\overline{\mathcal{G}}^{\mathbb{P}}$ will denote the corresponding completed filtration. We then define as in [37] a local martingale measure $\mathbb{P}$ as a probability measure such that B is a $\mathbb{P}$-local martingale. Since we are working in the Skorohod space, we can then define the continuous martingale part of B, noted B^c, and its purely discontinuous part, noted B^d, both being local martingales under each local martingale measures (see [19]). We then associate to the jumps of B a counting measure μ_{B^d}, which is a random measure on $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R}^+)\times E$ (where $E := \mathbb{R}^r\backslash\{0\}$ for some $r\in\mathbb{N}^*$), defined pathwise by

$$\mu_{B^d}([0,t],A) := \sum_{0<s\leq t}\mathbf{1}_{\{\Delta B_s^d\in A\}},\ \forall t\geq 0,\ \forall A\subset E. \tag{2.1}$$

We also denote by $\nu_t^{\mathbb{P}}(dt,dx)$ the compensator of $\mu_{B^d}(dt,dx)$, which is a predictable random measure, under $\mathbb{P}$ and by $\widetilde{\mu}_{B^d}^{\mathbb{P}}(dt,dx)$ the corresponding compensated measure.

We then denote $\overline{\mathcal{P}}_W$ the set of all local martingale measures $\mathbb{P}$ such that $\mathbb{P}$-a.s.

(i) The quadratic variation of B^c is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure dt and its density takes values in $\mathbb{S}_d^{>0}$.

(ii) The compensator $\nu_t^{\mathbb{P}}(dt,dx)$ under $\mathbb{P}$ is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure dt.

In this discontinuous setting, we will say that a probability measure $\mathbb{P}\in\overline{\mathcal{P}}_W$ satisfies the martingale representation property if for any $(\overline{\mathbb{F}}^{\mathbb{P}},\mathbb{P})$-local martingale M, there exists a unique $\overline{\mathbb{F}}^{\mathbb{P}}$-predictable processes H and a unique $\overline{\mathbb{F}}^{\mathbb{P}}$-predictable function U such that $(H,U)\in\mathbb{H}^2_{loc}(\mathbb{P})\times\mathbb{J}^2_{loc}(\mathbb{P})$ (those spaces are defined later) and

$$M_t = M_0 + \int_0^t H_s dB_s^c + \int_0^t\int_E U_s(x)\widetilde{\mu}_{B^d}^{\mathbb{P}}(ds,dx).$$

We now follow [39] and introduce their so-called universal filtration. For this we let $\mathcal{P}$ be a given subset of $\overline{\mathcal{P}}_W$, we define

Definition 2.1. (i) *A property is said to hold $\mathcal{P}$-quasi-surely ($\mathcal{P}$-q.s. for short), if it holds $\mathbb{P}-a.s.$ for all $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}$.*

(ii) *We call $\mathcal{P}$-polar sets the elements of $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{P}} := \cap_{\mathbb{P}\in\mathcal{P}}\mathcal{N}^{\mathbb{P}}(\mathcal{F}_\infty)$.*

Then, we define as in [39]

$$\widehat{\mathbb{F}}^{\mathcal{P}} := \left\{\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_t^{\mathcal{P}}\right\}_{t\geq 0} \text{ where } \widehat{\mathcal{F}}_t^{\mathcal{P}} := \bigcap_{\mathbb{P}\in\mathcal{P}} \left(\mathcal{F}_t^{\mathbb{P}} \vee \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{P}}\right).$$

Finally, we let $\mathcal{T}$ and $\widehat{\mathcal{T}}^{\mathcal{P}}$ the sets of all $\mathbb{F}$ and $\widehat{\mathbb{F}}^{\mathcal{P}}$ stopping times, and we recall that thanks to Lemma 2.4 in [39] we do not have to worry about the universal filtration not being complete under each $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}$.

2.2 The main problem

A crucial issue in the definition of the 2BSDEs in [37] is the aggregation of the quadratic variation of the canonical process B under a wide family of probability measures.

Let $\mathcal{P} \subset \overline{\mathcal{P}}_W$ be a set of non necessarily dominated probability measures and let $\{X^{\mathbb{P}}, \mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}\}$ be a family of random variables indexed by $\mathcal{P}$. One can think for example of the stochastic integrals $X_t^{\mathbb{P}} := {}^{(\mathbb{P})}\int_0^t H_s dB_s$, where $\{H_t, t \geq 0\}$ is a predictable process.

Definition 2.2. *An aggregator of the family $\{X^{\mathbb{P}}, \mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}\}$ is a r.v. $\hat{X}$ such that*

$$\hat{X} = X^{\mathbb{P}},\ \mathbb{P} - a.s, \text{ for every } \mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}.$$

Bichteler [4], Karandikar [20], or more recently Nutz [30] all showed in different contexts, and under different assumptions, that it is possible to find an aggregator for the Itô stochastic integrals ${}^{(\mathbb{P})}\int_0^t H_s dB_s$. A direct consequence of this result is the possibility to aggregate the quadratic variation process $\{[B, B]_t, t \geq 0\}$. Indeed, using Itô's formula, we can write

$$[B, B]_t = B_t B_t^T - 2\int_0^t B_{s^-} dB_s^T$$

and the aggregation of the stochastic integrals automatically yields the aggregation of the bracket $\{[B, B]_t, t \geq 0\}$.

This also allows us to give a pathwise definition of the process $\widehat{a}$, which is an aggregator for the density of the quadratic variation of the continuous part of B, by

$$\widehat{a}_t := \limsup_{\epsilon\searrow 0}\frac{1}{\epsilon}\left(\langle B^c\rangle_t - \langle B^c\rangle_{t-\epsilon}\right),$$

Soner, Touzi and Zhang [39], motivated by the study of stochastic target problems under volatility uncertainty, obtained an aggregation result for a family of probability measures corresponding to the laws of some continuous martingales on the canonical space $\Omega = \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^+, \mathbb{R}^d)$, under a *separability* assumption on the quadratic variations (see their definition 4.8) and under an additional *consistency* condition (which is usually only necessary) for the family to aggregate.

To define correctly the notion of second order backward SDEs with jumps, we need to aggregate not only the quadratic variation $[B,B]$ of the canonical process, but also its compensated jump measure. However, this predictable compensator is usually obtained thanks to the Doob-Meyer decomposition of the submartingale $[B,B]$. It is therefore obvious that this compensator depends explicitely on the underlying probability measure, and it is not clear at all whether an aggregator always exists or not. This is a first main difference with the continuous case. In order to solve this problem, we follow the spirit of [39] and restrict our set of probability measures (by adding an analogous separability condition for jump measures) so as to generalize some of their results to the case of processes with jumps.

After these first notations, in the following subsection, in order to construct a probability measure under which the canonical process has a given quadratic variation and a given jump measure, we will use the notion of martingale problem for semimartingales with general characteristics, as defined in the book by Jacod and Shiryaev [19] to which we refer.

2.3 Characterization by martingale problems

In this section, we extend the connection between diffusion processes and probability measures established in [39] thanks to weak solutions of SDEs, to our general jump case with the more general notion of martingale problems.

Let $\mathcal{N}$ be the set of $\mathbb{F}$-predictable random measures ν on $\mathcal{B}(E)$ satisfying

$$\int_0^t \int_E (1 \wedge |x|^2)\nu_s(dx)ds < +\infty \text{ and } \int_0^t \int_{|x|>1} x\nu_s(dx)ds < +\infty, \ \forall \omega \in \Omega, \tag{2.2}$$

and let $\mathcal{D}$ be the set of $\mathbb{F}$-predictable processes α taking values in $\mathbb{S}_d^{>0}$ with

$$\int_0^T |\alpha_t| dt < +\infty, \text{ for every } \omega \in \Omega.$$

We define a martingale problem as follows

Definition 2.3. *For $\mathbb{F}$-stopping times τ_1 and τ_2, for $(\alpha,\nu) \in \mathcal{D} \times \mathcal{N}$ and for a probability measure $\mathbb{P}_1$ on $\mathcal{F}_{\tau_1}$, we say that $\mathbb{P}$ is a solution of the martingale problem $(\mathbb{P}_1, \tau_1, \tau_2, \alpha, \nu)$ if*

(i) $\mathbb{P} = \mathbb{P}_1$ *on* $\mathcal{F}_{\tau_1}$.

(ii) *The canonical process B on $[\tau_1, \tau_2]$ is a semimartingale under $\mathbb{P}$ with characteristics*

$$\left(-\int_{\tau_1}^{\cdot} \int_E x \mathbf{1}_{|x|>1} \nu_s(dx)ds, \int_{\tau_1}^{\cdot} \alpha_s ds, \ \nu_s(dx)ds \right).$$

Remark 2.1. *We refer to Theorem $II.2.21$ in [19] for the fact that $\mathbb{P}$ is a solution of the martingale problem $(\mathbb{P}_1, \tau_1, \tau_2, \alpha, \nu)$ if and only if the following properties hold*

(i) $\mathbb{P} = \mathbb{P}_1$ *on* $\mathcal{F}_{\tau_1}$.

(ii) *The processes M, J and L defined below are $\mathbb{P}$-local martingales on $[\tau_1, \tau_2]$*

$$\begin{aligned}
M_t &:= B_t - \sum_{\tau_1 \le s \le t} \mathbf{1}_{|\Delta B_s|>1} \Delta B_s + \int_{\tau_1}^t \int_E x \mathbf{1}_{|x|>1} \nu_s(dx)ds, \ \tau_1 \le t \le \tau_2 \\
J_t &:= M_t^2 - \int_{\tau_1}^t \alpha_s ds - \int_{\tau_1}^t \int_E x^2 \nu_s(dx)ds, \ \tau_1 \le t \le \tau_2 \\
Q_t &:= \int_{\tau_1}^t \int_E g(x)\mu_B(ds,dx) - \int_{\tau_1}^t \int_E g(x)\nu_s(dx)ds, \ \tau_1 \le t \le \tau_2, \ \forall g \in \mathcal{C}^+(\mathbb{R}^d),
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{C}^+(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is discriminating family of bounded Borel functions (see Remark $II.2.20$ in [19] for more details).

We say that the martingale problem associated to (α, ν) has a unique solution if, for every stopping times τ_1, τ_2 and for every probability measure $\mathbb{P}_1$, the martingale problem $(\mathbb{P}_1, \tau_1, \tau_2, \alpha, \nu)$ has a unique solution.

Let now $\overline{\mathcal{A}}_W$ be the set of $(\alpha, \nu) \in \mathcal{D} \times \mathcal{N}$, such that there exists a solution to the martingale problem $(\mathbb{P}^0, 0, +\infty, \alpha, \nu)$, where $\mathbb{P}^0$ is such that $\mathbb{P}^0(B_0 = 0) = 1$.

We also denote by $\mathcal{A}_W$ the set of $(\alpha, \nu) \in \overline{\mathcal{A}}_W$ such that there exists a unique solution to the martingale problem $(\mathbb{P}_1, 0, +\infty, \alpha, \nu)$, where $\mathbb{P}_1$ is such that $\mathbb{P}_1(B_0 = 0) = 1$. Denote $\mathbb{P}_\nu^\alpha$ this unique solution. Finally we set

$$\mathcal{P}_W := \{\mathbb{P}_\nu^\alpha, \ (\alpha, \nu) \in \mathcal{A}_W\}.$$

Remark 2.2. *We take here as an initial condition that $B_0 = 0$. This does not generate a loss of generality, since at the end of the day, the probability measures under which we are going to work will all satisfy the $0-1$ Blumethal law. Hence, B_0 will have to be a constant and we choose 0 for simplicity.*

2.4 Notations and definitions

Following [39], for $a, b \in \mathcal{D}$ and $\nu, \beta \in \mathcal{N}$, we define the first disagreement times as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
\theta^{a,b} &:= \inf\left\{t \ge 0, \ \int_0^t a_s ds \ne \int_0^t b_s ds\right\}, \\
\theta_{\nu,\beta} &:= \inf\left\{t \ge 0, \ \int_0^t \int_E x\nu_s(dx)ds \ne \int_0^t \int_E x\beta_s(dx)ds\right\} \\
\theta_{\nu,\beta}^{a,b} &:= \theta^{a,b} \wedge \theta_{\nu,\beta}.
\end{aligned}$$

For every $\hat{\tau}$ in $\hat{\mathcal{F}}^{\mathcal{P}}$, we define the following event

$$\Omega_{\hat{\tau}}^{a,\nu,b,\beta} := \left\{\hat{\tau} < \theta_{\nu,\beta}^{a,b}\right\} \cup \left\{\hat{\tau} = \theta_{\nu,\beta}^{a,b} = +\infty\right\}.$$

Finally, we introduce the following notion inspired by [39]

Definition 2.4. *$\mathcal{A}_0 \subset \mathcal{A}_W$ is a generating class of coefficients if*

(i) $\mathcal{A}_0$ *is stable for the concatenation operation, i.e. if* $(a,\nu),(b,\beta)\in\mathcal{A}_0\times\mathcal{A}_0$ *then for each* t,

$$\left(a\mathbf{1}_{[0,t]}+b\mathbf{1}_{[t,+\infty)},\nu\mathbf{1}_{[0,t]}+\beta\mathbf{1}_{[t,+\infty)}\right)\in\mathcal{A}_0.$$

(ii) *For every* $(a,\nu),(b,\beta)\in\mathcal{A}_0\times\mathcal{A}_0$, $\theta^{a,b}_{\nu,\beta}$ *is a constant. Or equivalently, for each* t, $\Omega^{a,\nu,b,\beta}_t$ *equals* Ω *or* $\emptyset$.

Definition 2.5. *We say that* $\mathcal{A}$ *is a separable class of coefficients generated by* $\mathcal{A}_0$ *if* $\mathcal{A}_0$ *is a generating class of coefficients and if* $\mathcal{A}$ *consists of all processes* a *and random measures* ν *of the form*

$$\begin{aligned}a_t(\omega)&=\sum_{n=0}^{+\infty}\sum_{i=1}^{+\infty}a^{n,i}_t(\omega)\mathbf{1}_{E^i_n}(\omega)\mathbf{1}_{[\tau_n(\omega),\tau_{n+1}(\omega))}(t)\\ \nu_t(\omega)&=\sum_{n=0}^{+\infty}\sum_{i=1}^{+\infty}\nu^{n,i}\mathbf{1}_{\tilde{E}^i_n}(\omega)\mathbf{1}_{[\tilde{\tau}_n(\omega),\tilde{\tau}_{n+1})}(t),\end{aligned}\tag{2.3}$$

where for each i *and for each* n, $(a^{n,i},\nu^{n,i})\subset\mathcal{A}_0$, τ_n *and* $\tilde{\tau}_n$ *are* $\mathbb{F}$*-stopping times with* $\tau_0=0$, *such that*

(i) $\tau_n<\tau_{n+1}$ *on* $\{\tau_n<+\infty\}$ *and* $\tilde{\tau}_n<\tilde{\tau}_{n+1}$ *on* $\{\tilde{\tau}_n<+\infty\}$.

(ii) $\inf\{n\geq 0,\ \tau_n=+\infty\}+\inf\{n\geq 0,\ \tilde{\tau}_n=+\infty\}<\infty$.

(iii) τ_n *and* $\tilde{\tau}_n$ *take countably many values in some fixed* $I_0\subset[0,T]$ *which is countable and dense in* $[0,T]$.

(iv) *For each* n, $(E^n_i)_{i\geq 1}\subset\mathcal{F}_{\tau_n}$ *and* $(\tilde{E}^n_i)_{i\geq 1}\subset\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\tau}_n}$ *form a partition of* Ω.

Remark 2.3. *If we refine the subdivisions, we can always take a common sequence of stopping times* $(\tau_n)_{n\geq 0}$ *and common sets* $(E^n_i)_{i\geq 1,n\geq 0}$ *for* a *and for* ν. *This will be used throughout this section. Moreover, the definition indeed depends on the countable subset* I_0 *introduced above. We acknowledge that as in [39] this set could be changed, but for the sake of clarity, it will be fixed throughout the paper. We emphasize that will prove in [23] (see Theorem* 4.2*) that this has only a limited impact on our results. For practical purposes, one could take for instance* $I_0=\mathbb{Q}\cap[0,T]$.

Remark 2.4. *The form for* a *and* ν *in Definition 2.5 is directly inspired by the so-called properties of stability by concatenation and by bifurcation in the theory of stochastic control. As shown for instance in [16], [14] or [8] (see Remark* 3.1*), this property of control processes is tailor-made to be able to retrieve the dynamic programming principle, and is the least that once can expect. In our case, 2BSDEs can be seen formally as a weak version of a stochastic control problem for which the controls are* a *and* ν, *and we will see in Proposition* 4.2 *in [23] that this form is exactly what we need to recover the dynamic programming equation for our solution of a 2BSDE with jumps.*

Example 2.1. *$\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_0$ composed of deterministic processes a and ν form a generating class of coefficients.*

The following Proposition generalizes Proposition 4.11 of [39] and shows that a separable class of coefficients inherits the "good" properties of its generating class.

Proposition 2.1. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a separable class of coefficients generated by $\mathcal{A}_0$. Then*

(i) *If $\mathcal{A}_0 \subset \mathcal{A}_W$, then $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{A}_W$.*

(ii) *$\mathcal{A}$-quasi surely is equivalent to $\mathcal{A}_0$-quasi surely.*

(iii) *If every $\mathbb{P} \in \{\mathbb{P}^{\alpha}_{\nu},\ (\alpha,\nu) \in \mathcal{A}_0\}$ satisfies the martingale representation property, then every $\mathbb{P} \in \{\mathbb{P}^{\alpha}_{\nu},\ (\alpha,\nu) \in \mathcal{A}\}$ also satisfies the martingale representation property.*

(iv) *If every $\mathbb{P} \in \{\mathbb{P}^{\alpha}_{\nu},\ (\alpha,\nu) \in \mathcal{A}_0\}$ satisfies the Blumenthal $0-1$ law, then every $\mathbb{P} \in \{\mathbb{P}^{\alpha}_{\nu},\ (\alpha,\nu) \in \mathcal{A}\}$ also satisfies the Blumenthal $0-1$ law.*

As in [39], to prove this result, we need two Lemmas. The first one is a straightforward generalization of Lemma 4.12 in [39], so we omit the proof. The second one is analogous to Lemma 4.13 in [39].

Lemma 2.1. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a separable class of coefficients generated by $\mathcal{A}_0$. For any $(a,\nu) \in \mathcal{A}$, and any $\mathbb{F}$-stopping time $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$, there exist $\tilde{\tau} \in \mathcal{T}$ with $\tilde{\tau} \geq \tau$, a sequence $(a^n,\nu^n)_{n\geq 1} \subset \mathcal{A}_0$ and a partition $(E_n)_{n\geq 1} \subset \mathcal{F}_\tau$ of Ω such that $\tilde{\tau} > \tau$ on $\{\tau < +\infty\}$ and*

$$a_t(\omega) = \sum_{n\geq 1} a^n_t(\omega)\mathbf{1}_{E_n}(\omega) \text{ and } \nu_t(\omega) = \sum_{n\geq 1} \nu^n_t(\omega)\mathbf{1}_{E_n}(\omega),\ t < \tilde{\tau}. \tag{2.4}$$

In particular, $E_n \subset \Omega^{a,\nu,a^n,\nu^n}_{\hat{\tau}}$ which implies that $\cup_n \Omega^{a,\nu,a^n,\nu^n}_{\hat{\tau}} = \Omega$. Finally, if a and ν take the form 2.3 and $\tau \geq \tau_n$, then we can choose $\tilde{\tau} \geq \tau_{n+1}$.

Proof. We refer to the proof of Lemma 4.12 in [39]. □

Lemma 2.2. *Let $\tau_1, \tau_2 \in \mathcal{T}$ be two stopping times such that $\tau_1 \leq \tau_2$, and $(a^i,\nu^i)_{i\geq 1} \subset \overline{\mathcal{A}}_W$ and let $\{E_i,\ i \geq 1\} \subset \mathcal{F}_{\tau_1}$ be a partition of Ω. Finally let $\mathbb{P}^0$ be a probability measure on $\mathcal{F}_{\tau_1}$ and let $\{\mathbb{P}^i,\ i \geq 1\}$ be a sequence of probabilty measures such that for each i, $\mathbb{P}^i$ is a solution of the martingale problem $(\mathbb{P}^0, \tau_1, \tau_2, a^i, \nu^i)$. Define*

$$\mathbb{P}(E) := \sum_{i\geq 1} \mathbb{P}^i(E \cap E_i) \text{ for all } \mathcal{F}_{\tau_2},$$

$$a_t := \sum_{i\geq 1} a^i_t \mathbf{1}_{E_i} \text{ and } \nu_t := \sum_{i\geq 1} \nu^i_t \mathbf{1}_{E_i},\ t \in [\tau_1, \tau_2].$$

Then $\mathbb{P}$ is a solution of the martingale problem $(\mathbb{P}^0, \tau_1, \tau_2, a, \nu)$.

Proof. By definition, $\mathbb{P} = \mathbb{P}^0$ on $\mathcal{F}_{\tau_1}$. In view of Remark 2.1, it is enough to prove that M, J and Q are $\mathbb{P}$-local martingales on $[\tau_1, \tau_2]$. By localizing if necessary, we may assume as usual that all these processes are actually bounded. For any stopping times $\tau_1 \leq R \leq S \leq \tau_2$, and any bounded $\mathcal{F}_R$-measurable random variable η, we have

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}\left[(M_S - M_R)\eta\right] = \sum_{i\geq 1} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^i}\left[(M_S - M_R)\eta\mathbf{1}_{E_i}\right] = \sum_{i\geq 1} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^i}\left[\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^i}[(M_S - M_R)|\mathcal{F}_R]\eta\mathbf{1}_{E_i}\right] = 0.$$

Thus M is a $\mathbb{P}$-local martingale on $[\tau_1, \tau_2]$. We can prove in exactly the same manner that J and Q are also $\mathbb{P}$-local martingales on $[\tau_1, \tau_2]$ and the proof is complete. □

Proof of Proposition 2.1. The proof follows closely the proof of Proposition 4.11 in [39] and we give it for the conenience of the reader.

(i) We take $(a, \nu) \in \mathcal{A}$, let us prove that $(a, \nu) \in \mathcal{A}_W$. We fix two stopping times θ_1, θ_2 in $\mathcal{T}$. We define a sequence $(\tilde{\tau}_n)_{n\geq 0}$ as follows:

$$\tilde{\tau}_0 := \theta_1 \text{ and } \tilde{\tau}_n := (\tau_n \vee \theta_1) \wedge \theta_2,\ n \geq 1.$$

To prove that the martingale problem $(\mathbb{P}^0, \theta_1, \theta_2, a, \nu)$ has a unique solution, we prove by induction on n that the martingale problem $(\mathbb{P}^0, \tilde{\tau}_0, \tilde{\tau}_n, a, \nu)$ has a unique solution.

Step 1 of the induction: Let $n = 1$, and let us first construct a solution to the martingale problem $(\mathbb{P}^0, \tilde{\tau}_0, \tilde{\tau}_1, a, \nu)$. For this purpose, we apply Lemma 2.1 with $\tau = \tilde{\tau}_0$ and $\tilde{\tau} = \tilde{\tau}_1$, which leads to $a_t = \sum_{i\geq 1} a^i_t \mathbf{1}_{E_i}$ and $\nu_t = \sum_{i\geq 1} \nu^i_t \mathbf{1}_{E_i}$ for all $t < \tilde{\tau}_1$, where $(a^i, \nu^i) \in \mathcal{A}_0$ and $\{E_i,\ i \geq 1\} \subset \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\tau}_0}$ form a partition of Ω. For $i \geq 1$, let $\mathbb{P}^{0,i}$ be the unique solution of the martingale problem $(\mathbb{P}^0, \tilde{\tau}_0, \tilde{\tau}_1, a_i, \nu_i)$ and define

$$\mathbb{P}^{0,a}(E) := \sum_{i\geq 1} \mathbb{P}^{0,i}(E \cap E_i) \text{ for all } E \in \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\tau}_1}.$$

Lemma 2.2 tells us that $\mathbb{P}^{0,a}$ solves the martingale problem $(\mathbb{P}^0, \tilde{\tau}_0, \tilde{\tau}_1, a, \nu)$. Now let $\mathbb{P}$ be an arbitrary solution of the martingale problem $(\mathbb{P}^0, \tilde{\tau}_0, \tilde{\tau}_1, a, \nu)$, and let us prove that $\mathbb{P} = \mathbb{P}^{0,a}$. We first define

$$\mathbb{P}^i(E) := \mathbb{P}(E \cap E_i) + \mathbb{P}^{0,i}(E \cap E_i^c),\ \forall E \in \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\tau}_1}.$$

Using Lemma 2.2, and the facts that $a^i = a\mathbf{1}_{E_i} + a^i\mathbf{1}_{E_i^c}$ and $\nu^i = \nu\mathbf{1}_{E_i} + \nu^i\mathbf{1}_{E_i^c}$, we conclude that $\mathbb{P}^i$ solves the martingale problem $(\mathbb{P}^0, \tilde{\tau}_0, \tilde{\tau}_1, a^i, \nu^i)$. This problem having a unique solution, we have $\mathbb{P}^i = \mathbb{P}^{0,i}$ on $\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\tau}_1}$. This implies that for each $i \geq 1$ and for each $E \in \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\tau}_1}$, $\mathbb{P}^i(E \cap E_i) = \mathbb{P}^{0,i}(E \cap E_i)$, and finally

$$\mathbb{P}^{0,a}(E) = \sum_{i\geq 1} \mathbb{P}^{0,i}(E \cap E_i) = \sum_{i\geq 1} \mathbb{P}^i(E \cap E_i) = \mathbb{P}(E),\ \forall E \in \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\tau}_1}.$$

Step 2 of the induction: We assume that the martingale problem $(\mathbb{P}^0, \tilde{\tau}_0, \tilde{\tau}_n, a, \nu)$ has a unique solution denoted $\mathbb{P}^n$. Using the same reasoning as above, we see that the martingale problem $(\mathbb{P}^n, \tilde{\tau}_n, \tilde{\tau}_{n+1}, a, \nu)$ has a unique solution, denoted $\mathbb{P}^{n+1}$. Then the processes M, J and Q defined in Remark 2.1 are $\mathbb{P}^{n+1}$-local martingales on $[\tilde{\tau}_n, \tilde{\tau}_{n+1}]$, and since $\mathbb{P}^{n+1}$ coincides with $\mathbb{P}^n$ on $\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\tau}_n}$, M, J and Q are also $\mathbb{P}^{n+1}$-local martingales on $[\tilde{\tau}_0, \tilde{\tau}_n]$. And hence $\mathbb{P}^{n+1}$ solves the martingale problem $(\mathbb{P}^0, \tilde{\tau}_0, \tilde{\tau}_{n+1}, a, \nu)$. We suppose now that $\mathbb{P}$ is another arbitrary solution to the martingale problem $(\mathbb{P}^0, \tilde{\tau}_0, \tilde{\tau}_{n+1}, a, \nu)$. By the induction assumption, $\mathbb{P}^n = \mathbb{P}$ on $\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\tau}_n}$, then $\mathbb{P}$ solves the martingale problem $(\mathbb{P}^n, \tilde{\tau}_n, \tilde{\tau}_{n+1}, a, \nu)$, and by uniqueness $\mathbb{P} = \mathbb{P}^{n+1}$ on $\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\tau}_{n+1}}$. The induction is now complete.

Remark that $\mathcal{F}_{\theta_2} = \vee_{n\geq 1}\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\tau}_n}$. Indeed, since $\inf\{n \geq 1,\ \tau_n = +\infty\} < +\infty$, then $\inf\{n \geq 1,\ \tilde{\tau}_n = \theta_2\} < +\infty$. This allows to define $\mathbb{P}^\infty(E) := \mathbb{P}^n(E)$ for $E \in \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{\tau}_n}$ and to extend it uniquely to $\mathcal{F}_{\theta_2}$. Now using again Remark 2.1, we conclude that $\mathbb{P}^\infty$ solves $(\mathbb{P}^0, \theta_1, \theta_2, a, \nu)$ and is unique.

(ii) We now prove that $\mathcal{A}$-quasi surely is equivalent to $\mathcal{A}_0$-quasi surely.

We take $(a, \nu) \in \mathcal{A}$ and we apply Lemma 2.1 with $\tau = +\infty$ to write $a_t = \sum_{i\geq 1} a_t^i \mathbf{1}_{E_i}$ and $\nu_t = \sum_{i\geq 1} \nu_t^i \mathbf{1}_{E_i}$ for all $t \geq 0$, where $(a^i, \nu^i) \in \mathcal{A}_0$ and $\{E_i,\ i \geq 1\} \subset \mathcal{F}_\infty$ form a partition of Ω. Take a set E such that $\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{\nu}}^{\tilde{a}}(E) = 0$ for every $(\tilde{a}, \tilde{\nu}) \in \mathcal{A}_0$, then

$$\mathbb{P}_\nu^a(E) = \sum_{i\geq 1} \mathbb{P}_\nu^a(E \cap E_i) = \sum_{i\geq 1} \mathbb{P}_{\nu^i}^{a^i}(E \cap E_i) = 0.$$

(iii) By (i), since $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{A}_W$, for any $(a, \nu) \in \mathcal{A}$, the corresponding martingale problem has a unique solution, which is therefore an extremal point in the set of solutions. Hence, we can apply Theorem III.4.29 in [19] to obtain immediately the predictable representation property.

(iv) Take $(a, \nu) \in \mathcal{A}$ of the form (2.3), in which we can take $\tau_0 = 0$ without loss of generality. $\mathbb{P}_\nu^a$ is the law on $[0, \tau_1]$ of a semimartingale with characteristics

$$\left(-\int_0^t \int_E x\mathbf{1}_{|x|>1}\tilde{\nu}_s(dx)ds, \int_0^t \tilde{a}_s ds,\ \tilde{\nu}_s(dx)ds\right),$$

where

$$\tilde{a}_t := \sum_{i\geq 1} a^{0,i}\mathbf{1}_{E_0^i} \text{ and } \tilde{\nu}_t := \sum_{i\geq 1} \nu^{0,i}\mathbf{1}_{E_0^i},$$

where $\{E_0^i,\ i \geq 1\} \subset \mathcal{F}_0$ is a partition of Ω. Since $\mathcal{F}_0$ is trivial, the partition is only composed of Ω and $\emptyset$, and then

$$\tilde{a}_t := a_t^{0,1} \text{ and } \tilde{\nu}_t = \nu_t^{0,1}.$$

Then for $E \in \mathcal{F}_{0^+}$, $\mathbb{P}_\nu^a(E) = \mathbb{P}_{\tilde{\nu}}^{\tilde{a}}(E) = 0$, since $\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{\nu}}^{\tilde{a}}$ satisfies the Blumenthal $0-1$ law by hypothesis. □

Remark 2.5. *If $\mathcal{A}_0$ consists of deterministic mappings as in example 2.1, then $\mathbb{P}_\nu^a$ is the law on $[0, \tau_1]$ of an additive process with non random characteristics, for which the Blumenthal $0-1$ law holds (see for instance [36]).*

We now state the following Proposition which tells us that our probability measure coincide until their first time of disagreement.

Proposition 2.2. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a separable class of coefficients generated by $\mathcal{A}_0$, let $\mathcal{P}_\mathcal{A} := \{\mathbb{P}_\nu^a,\ (a, \nu) \in \mathcal{A}\}$ and let $(a, \nu) \times (b, \beta) \in \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}$.*

(i) $\theta^{a,b}_{\nu,\beta}$ *is an* $\mathbb{F}$*-stopping time taking countably many values.*

(ii) *Moreover, we have the following coherence condition*

$$\mathbb{P}^a_\nu\left(E\cap\Omega^{a,\nu,b,\beta}_{\hat\tau}\right)=\mathbb{P}^b_\beta\left(E\cap\Omega^{a,\nu,b,\beta}_{\hat\tau}\right),\ \forall\hat\tau\in\hat{\mathcal{T}}^{\mathcal{P}_\mathcal{A}},\ \forall E\in\hat{\mathcal{F}}^{\mathcal{P}_\mathcal{A}}_{\hat\tau}.$$

Proof. (i) Let us prove that $\left\{\theta^{a,b}_{\nu,\beta}\le t_1\right\}\in\mathcal{F}_{t_1}$, for any $t_1\ge 0$.

We apply Lemma 2.1 for (a,ν) and (b,β) with $\tau=t_1$ to obtain the existence of (a^n_t,ν^n_t), (b^n_t,β^n_t) in $\mathcal{A}_0$ and $E_n\subset\mathcal{F}_{t_1}$ forming a partition of Ω, such that (a^n,b^n,ν^n,β^n) coincide with (a,b,ν,β) on E_n for $t<\tilde\tau$, where $\tilde\tau>t_1$. Then

$$\left\{\theta^{a,b}_{\nu,\beta}\le t_1\right\}=\bigcup_{n\ge1}\left\{\theta^{a^n,b^n}_{\nu^n,\beta^n}\le t_1\right\}\cap E_n$$

By the constant disagreement times property of $\mathcal{A}_0$, $\left\{\theta^{a^n,b^n}_{\nu^n,\beta^n}\le t_1\right\}$ is either Ω or $\emptyset$, and since $E_n\in\mathcal{F}_{t_1}$, then

$$\left\{\theta^{a,b}_{\nu,\beta}\le t_1\right\}\in\mathcal{F}_{t_1}.$$

To show that $\theta^{a,b}_{\nu,\beta}$ takes countably many values, we apply again Lemma 2.1 with $\tau=\theta^{a,b}_{\nu,\beta}$, to obtain the existence of (a^n_t,ν^n_t), (b^n_t,β^n_t) in $\mathcal{A}_0$ and $E_n\subset\mathcal{F}_\tau$ forming a partition of Ω, such that (a^n,b^n,ν^n,β^n) coincide with (a,b,ν,β) on E_n for $t<\tilde\tau$, where $\tilde\tau>\tau$. Since $\theta^{a^n,b^n}_{\nu^n,\beta^n}$ is a constant and given that $\theta^{a,b}_{\nu,\beta}=\theta^{a^n,b^n}_{\nu^n,\beta^n}$ on E_n, we have the desired result.

(ii) We write that for any $E\in\hat{\mathcal{F}}^{\mathcal{P}_\mathcal{A}}_{\hat\tau}$

$$\begin{aligned}E\cap\Omega^{a,\nu,b,\beta}_{\hat\tau}\cap\left\{\theta^{a,b}_{\nu,\beta}\le t\right\}&=E\cap\left\{\hat\tau<\theta^{a,b}_{\nu,\beta}\right\}\cap\left\{\theta^{a,b}_{\nu,\beta}\le t\right\}\\&=\bigcup_{m\ge1}\left(E\cap\left\{\hat\tau<\theta^{a,b}_{\nu,\beta}\right\}\cap\left\{\hat\tau\le t-\frac{1}{m}\right\}\cap\left\{\theta^{a,b}_{\nu,\beta}\le t\right\}\right).\end{aligned}$$

Since $\left\{\theta^{a,b}_{\nu,\beta}\le t\right\}\in\mathcal{F}_t$, we get that for any $m\ge1$,

$$E\cap\left\{\hat\tau<\theta^{a,b}_{\nu,\beta}\right\}\cap\left\{\hat\tau\le t-\frac{1}{m}\right\}\in\hat{\mathcal{F}}^{\mathcal{P}_\mathcal{A}}_{t-\frac{1}{m}}\subset\mathcal{F}^+_{t-\frac{1}{m}}\vee\mathcal{N}^{\mathbb{P}^a_\nu}(\mathcal{F}_\infty)\subset\mathcal{F}_t\vee\mathcal{N}^{\mathbb{P}^a_\nu}(\mathcal{F}_\infty),$$

and then

$$E\cap\Omega^{a,\nu,b,\beta}_{\hat\tau}\in\mathcal{F}_{\theta^{a,b}_{\nu,\beta}}\vee\mathcal{N}^{\mathbb{P}^a_\nu}(\mathcal{F}_\infty).$$

From this last assertion, we deduce that there exist measurable sets $E^{a,\nu}_i$, $E^{b,\beta}_i$ belonging to $\mathcal{F}_{\theta^{a,b}_{\nu,\beta}}$, $i=1,2$, such that

$$\begin{gathered}E^{a,\nu}_1\subset E\cap\Omega^{a,\nu,b,\beta}_{\hat\tau}\subset E^{a,\nu}_2,\ E^{b,\beta}_1\subset E\cap\Omega^{a,\nu,b,\beta}_{\hat\tau}\subset E^{b,\beta}_2\\ \mathbb{P}^a_\nu\left(E^{a,\nu}_2\backslash E^{a,\nu}_1\right)=\mathbb{P}^b_\beta\left(E^{b,\beta}_2\backslash E^{b,\beta}_1\right)=0.\end{gathered}$$

We set $E^1 := E_1^{a,\nu} \cup E_1^{b,\beta}$ and $E^2 := E_2^{b,\beta} \cap E_1^{b,\beta}$, then

$$E^1,\, E^2 \in \mathcal{F}_{\theta^{a,b}_{\nu,\beta}},\ E^1 \subset E \cap \Omega_{\hat{\tau}}^{a,\nu,b,\beta} \subset E^2 \text{ and } \mathbb{P}_\nu^a\left(E^2 \backslash E^1\right) = \mathbb{P}_\beta^b\left(E^2 \backslash E^1\right) = 0.$$

This implies that

$$\mathbb{P}_\nu^a\left(E \cap \Omega_{\hat{\tau}}^{a,\nu,b,\beta}\right) = \mathbb{P}_\nu^a(E^2) \text{ and } \mathbb{P}_\beta^b\left(E \cap \Omega_{\hat{\tau}}^{a,\nu,b,\beta}\right) = \mathbb{P}_\beta^b(E^2),$$

but the solutions of the martingale problems $(\mathbb{P}^0, 0, \theta^{a,b}_{\nu,\beta}, a, \nu)$ and $(\mathbb{P}^0, 0, \theta^{a,b}_{\nu,\beta}, b, \beta)$ are equal by definition. And since $E^2 \in \mathcal{F}_{\theta^{a,b}_{\nu,\beta}}$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}_\nu^a(E^2) = \mathbb{P}_\beta^b(E^2)$$

which gives the desired result. □

We now have every tools we need to state and prove the main resut of this section, which generalizes the aggregation result of Theorem 5.1 in [39]. For this purpose, we use the more general aggregation result of Cohen [10], that does not concern only volatility or jump measure uncertainty.

Theorem 2.1. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a separable class of coefficients generated by $\mathcal{A}_0$ and $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}}$ the corresponding probability measures. Let*

$$\left\{X^{a,\nu},\, (a,\nu) \in \mathcal{A}\right\},$$

be a family of $\hat{\mathbb{F}}^{\mathbb{P}}$-progressively measurable processes.

Then the following two conditions are equivalent

(i) $\{X^{a,\nu},\, (a,\nu) \in \mathcal{A}\}$ *satisfies the following consistency condition*

$$X^{a,\nu} = X^{b,\beta},\ \mathbb{P}_\nu^a\text{-a.s. on } [0, \theta^{a,b}_{\nu,\beta}) \text{ for any } (a,\nu) \in \mathcal{A} \text{ and } (b,\beta) \in \mathcal{A}.$$

(ii) *There exists a $\mathcal{P}$-q.s unique process X such that*

$$X = X^{a,\nu},\ \mathbb{P}_\nu^a\text{-a.s.},\ \forall (a,\nu) \in \mathcal{A}.$$

Proof. We first prove that (i) implies (ii). Using Lemma 3 in [10], we see that the definition of the generating classes, together with Proposition 2.2, implies that the family $\mathcal{P}$ satisfies the Hahn property defined in [10]. Now Theorem 4 of [10] gives the result. The fact that (ii) implies (i) is a consequence of the unicity of the solution of the martingale problem $(\mathbb{P}^0, 0, \theta^{a,b}_{\nu,\beta}, a, \nu)$ on $[0, \theta^{a,b}_{\nu,\beta})$. □

Now that we have Theorem 2.1, we can answer our first issue concerning the aggregation of the predictable compensators associated to the jump measure μ_{B^d} of the canonical process. Indeed, let $\mathcal{A}$ be a separable class of coefficients generated by $\mathcal{A}_0$ and $\mathcal{P} := \{\mathbb{P}_\nu^a,\, (a,\nu) \in \mathcal{A}\}$. Then, for each Borel set $A \in \mathcal{B}(E)$ and for each $t \in [0,T]$ the family $\{\nu_t^{\mathbb{P}_\nu^a}(A)\}_{(a,\nu)\in\mathcal{A}}$ clearly satisfies the consistency condition above (because it is defined through the Doob-Meyer decomposition, see Proposition 6.6 in [39]), and therefore there exists a process $\widehat{\nu}$ such that

$$\widehat{\nu}_t(A) = \nu_t^{\mathbb{P}}(A), \text{ for every } \mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{A}}. \tag{2.5}$$

We then denote

$$\widetilde{\mu}_{B^d}(dt, dx) := \mu_{B^d}(dt, dx) - \widehat{\nu}_t(dx)dt.$$

2.4.1 The strong formulation

In this Section, we will concentrate on a subset of $\mathcal{P}_W$. For this purpose, we define

$$\mathcal{V} := \{\nu \in \mathcal{N},\ (I_d, \nu) \in \mathcal{A}_W\}.$$

For each $\nu \in \mathcal{V}$, we denote $\mathbb{P}^\nu := \mathbb{P}^{I_d}_\nu$ and for each $\alpha \in \mathcal{D}$, we define

$$\mathbb{P}^{\alpha,\nu} := \mathbb{P}^\nu \circ (X^\alpha_\cdot)^{-1},\ \text{where } X^\alpha_t := \int_0^t \alpha_s^{1/2} dB^c_s + B^d_t,\ \mathbb{P}^\nu - a.s. \tag{2.6}$$

Let us now define,

$$\mathcal{P}_S := \{\mathbb{P}^{\alpha,\nu},\ (\alpha,\nu) \in \mathcal{A}_W\}.$$

Then α is the quadratic variation density of the continuous part of X^α and

$$dB^c_s = \alpha_s^{-1/2} dX^{\alpha,c}_s,$$

under $\mathbb{P}^\nu$. Moreover, $\nu_t(dx)dt$ is the compensator of the measure associated to the jumps of X^α and $\Delta X^\alpha_s = \Delta B_s$ under $\mathbb{P}^\nu$. We also define for each $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}_W$ the following process

$$L^{\mathbb{P}}_t := W^{\mathbb{P}}_t + B^d_t,\ \mathbb{P} - a.s., \tag{2.7}$$

where $W^{\mathbb{P}}_t$ is a $\mathbb{P}$-Brownian motion defined by

$$W^{\mathbb{P}}_t := \int_0^t \widehat{a}_s^{-1/2} dB^c_s.$$

Then, $\mathcal{P}_S$ is a subset of $\mathcal{P}_W$ and we have by definition

$$\text{the } \mathbb{P}^{\alpha,\nu}\text{-distribution of } (B, \widehat{a}, \widehat{\nu}, L^{\mathbb{P}^{\alpha,\nu}}) \text{ is equal to the } \mathbb{P}^\nu\text{-distribution of } (W^\alpha, \alpha, \nu, B). \tag{2.8}$$

We also have the following characterization in terms of filtrations, which is similar to Lemma 8.1 in [39]

Lemma 2.3. $\mathcal{P}_S = \left\{\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}_W,\ \overline{\mathbb{F}^{L^{\mathbb{P}}}}^{\mathbb{P}} = \overline{\mathbb{F}}^{\mathbb{P}}\right\}$

Proof. By the above remarks, it is clear that α and B are $\overline{\mathbb{F}^{X^\alpha}}^{\mathbb{P}^\nu}$-progressively measurable. But by definition, $\mathbb{F}$ is generated by B, thus we conclude easily that $\overline{\mathbb{F}}^{\mathbb{P}^\nu} \subset \overline{\mathbb{F}^{X^\alpha}}^{\mathbb{P}^\nu}$. The other inclusion being clear by definition, we have

$$\overline{\mathbb{F}}^{\mathbb{P}^\nu} = \overline{\mathbb{F}^{X^\alpha}}^{\mathbb{P}^\nu}.$$

Now we can use (2.8) to obtain that $\overline{\mathbb{F}^{L^{\mathbb{P}^{\alpha,\nu}}}}^{\mathbb{P}^{\alpha,\nu}} = \overline{\mathbb{F}}^{\mathbb{P}^{\alpha,\nu}}$.

Conversely, let $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}_W$ be such that $\overline{\mathbb{F}^{L^{\mathbb{P}^{\alpha,\nu}}}}^{\mathbb{P}^{\alpha,\nu}} = \overline{\mathbb{F}}^{\mathbb{P}^{\alpha,\nu}}$. Then, there exists some measurable function β such that $B_\cdot = \beta(L^{\mathbb{P}}_\cdot)$. Let ν be the compensator of the measure associated to the jumps of B under $\mathbb{P}$. Define then,

$$\alpha_t := \frac{d < \beta(B), \beta(B) >^c_t}{dt},$$

we conclude then that $\mathbb{P} = \mathbb{P}^{\alpha,\nu}$. □

Define now $\mathcal{A}_S := \{(\alpha,\nu) \in \mathcal{A}_W,\ \mathbb{P}^\alpha_\nu \in \mathcal{P}_S\}$. It is important to notice that in our framework, it is not clear whether all the probability measures in $\mathcal{P}_S$ satisfy the martingale representation property and the Blumenthal $0-1$ law. Indeed, this is due to the fact that the processus $L^{\mathbb{P}}$ does not necessarily satisfy them. This is a major difference with [39]. Nonetheless, if we restrict ourselves to a subset of $\mathcal{P}_S$, we are going to see that we can still recover them. First, we have the following generalization of Proposition 8.3 of [39].

Proposition 2.3. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a separable class of coefficients generated by $\mathcal{A}_0$. If $\mathcal{A}_0 \subset \mathcal{A}_S$, then $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{A}_S$.*

Proof. This is a straightforward generalization of the proof of Proposition 8.3 in [39], using the same kind of modifications as in our previous proofs, so we omit it. □

Let us now consider the set introduced above in Example 2.1

$$\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_0 := \{(\alpha,\nu) \in \mathcal{D} \times \mathcal{N} \text{ which are deterministic}\},\ \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_0} := \left\{\mathbb{P}^\alpha_\nu,\ (\alpha,\nu) \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_0\right\}.$$

$\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_0$ is a generating class of coefficients, and it is a well known result that $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_0 \subset \mathcal{A}_W$ (see Theorem III.2.16 in [19]) and that every probability measure in $\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_0}$ satisfies the martingale representation property and the Blumenthal $0-1$ law, since the canonical process is actually an additive process under them. Moreover we also have

Lemma 2.4. *We have $\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_0} \subset \mathcal{P}_S$.*

Proof. Let $\mathbb{P} := \mathbb{P}^\alpha_\nu$ be a probability measure in $\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_0}$. As argued previously, we have $\mathbb{P}-a.s.$

$$B^c_t = \int_0^t \alpha_s^{1/2} dL^{\mathbb{P},c}_t \text{ and } \Delta L^{\mathbb{P}}_t = \Delta B_t.$$

Since α is deterministic, it is clear that we have $\overline{\mathbb{F}}^{\mathbb{P}} = \overline{\mathbb{F}^{L^{\mathbb{P}}}}^{\mathbb{P}}$, which implies the result. □

Finally, we consider $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$ the separable class of coefficients generated by $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_0$ and $\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{A}}}$ the corresponding set of probability measures. Then, using the above results and Propositions 2.1 and 2.3, we have

Proposition 2.4. *$\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{A}}} \subset \mathcal{P}_S$ and every probability measure in $\mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{A}}}$ satisfies the martingale representation property and the Blumenthal $0-1$ law.*

Proof. Once we know that the augmented filtration generated by $L^{\mathbb{P}}$ satisfies the martingale representation property and the Blumenthal $0-1$ law for every $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_0}$, we can argue exactly as in the proof of Lemma 8.2 to obtain the results for $\mathcal{P}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_0}$. The result for $\mathcal{P}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}}$ then comes easily from Proposition 2.1. □

Remark 2.6. *In our jump framework, we need to impose this separability structure on both α and ν, in order to be able to retrieve not only the aggregation result of Theorem 2.1 but also the property that all our probability measures satisfy the Blumenthal $0-1$ law and the martingale representation property. However, if one is only interested in being able to* *consider standard BSDEs with jumps, then we do not need the aggregation result and we can work with a larger set of probability measures without restrictions on the* α. *Namely, let us define*

$$\overline{\mathcal{P}}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}} := \left\{ \mathbb{P}^{\alpha,\nu},\ \alpha \in \mathcal{D},\ (I_d, \nu) \in \widetilde{\mathcal{A}} \right\}.$$

Then we can show as above that $\overline{\mathcal{P}}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}} \subset \mathcal{P}_S$ *and that all the probability measures in* $\overline{\mathcal{P}}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}}$ *satisfy the Blumenthal* $0-1$ *law and the martingale representation property. This is going to be important in our accompanying paper [23].*

3 Preliminaries on 2BSDEs

3.1 The non-linear Generator

In this subsection we will introduce the function which will serve as the generator of our 2BSDE with jumps. Let us define the spaces

$$\hat{L}^2 := \bigcap_{\nu \in \mathcal{N}} L^2(\nu) \text{ and } \hat{L}^1 := \bigcap_{\nu \in \mathcal{N}} L^1(\nu).$$

For any $\mathcal{C}^1$ function v with bounded gradient, any $\omega \in \Omega$ and any $0 \leq t \leq T$, we denote $\tilde{v}$ the function

$$\tilde{v}(e) := v(e + \omega(t)) - v(\omega(t)) - \mathbf{1}_{\{|e| \leq 1\}}\ e.(\nabla v)(\omega(t)), \text{ for } e \in E.$$

The hypothesis on v ensure that $\tilde{v}$ is an element of $\hat{L}^1$. We then consider a map

$$H_t(\omega, y, z, u, \gamma, \tilde{v}) : [0,T] \times \Omega \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \hat{L}^2 \times D_1 \times D_2 \to \mathbb{R},$$

where $D_1 \subset \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ is a given subset containing 0 and $D_2 \subset \hat{L}^1 \cap \mathcal{N}^*$, where $\mathcal{N}^*$ denotes the topological dual of $\mathcal{N}$.

Define the following conjugate of H with respect to γ and v by

$$F_t(\omega, y, z, u, a, \nu) := \sup_{\{\gamma, \tilde{v}\} \in D_1 \times D_2} \left\{ \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Tr}(a\gamma) + < \tilde{v}, \nu > - H_t(\omega, y, z, u, \gamma, \tilde{v}) \right\},$$

for $a \in \mathbb{S}_d^{>0}$ and $\nu \in \mathcal{N}$, and where $< \tilde{v}, \nu >$ is defined by

$$< \tilde{v}, \nu > := \int_E \tilde{v}(e) \nu(de). \tag{3.1}$$

The quantity $< \tilde{v}, \nu >$ will not appear again in the paper, since we formulate the needed hypothesis for the backward equation generator directly on the function F. But the particular form of $< \tilde{v}, \nu >$ comes from the intuition that the second order BSDE with jumps is an essential supremum of classical BSDEs with jumps (BSDEJs). Indeed, solutions to markovian BSDEJs provide viscosity solutions to some parabolic partial integro-differential equations whose non local operator is given by a quantity similar to $< \tilde{v}, \nu >$ (see [2] for more details). We define

$$\widehat{F}_t(y, z, u) := F_t(y, z, u, \widehat{a}_t, \widehat{\nu}_t) \text{ and } \widehat{F}_t^0 := \widehat{F}_t(0, 0, 0),\ \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{A}}\text{-q.s.} \tag{3.2}$$

We denote by $D^1_{F_t(y,z,u)}$ the domain of F in a and by $D^2_{F_t(y,z,u)}$ the domain of F in ν, for a fixed (t,ω,y,z,u). As in [37] we fix a constant $\kappa \in (1,2]$ and restrict the probability measures in $\mathcal{P}^\kappa_H \subset \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{A}}}$

Definition 3.1. *$\mathcal{P}^\kappa_H$ consists of all $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{A}}}$ such that*

(i) $\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}\left[\int_0^T \int_E x^2 \widehat{\nu}_t(dx)dt\right] < +\infty.$

(ii) $\underline{a}^{\mathbb{P}} \leq \widehat{a} \leq \bar{a}^{\mathbb{P}},\ dt \times d\mathbb{P} - as\ for\ some\ \underline{a}^{\mathbb{P}}, \bar{a}^{\mathbb{P}} \in \mathbb{S}^{>0}_d,\ and\ \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}\left[\left(\int_0^T \left|\widehat{F}^0_t\right|^\kappa dt\right)^{\frac{2}{\kappa}}\right] < +\infty.$

Remark 3.1. *The above conditions assumed on the probability measures in $\mathcal{P}^\kappa_H$ ensure that under any $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}^\kappa_H$, the canonical process B is actually a true càdlàg martingale. This will be important when we will define standard BSDEs under each of those probability measures.*

We now state our main assumptions on the function F which will be our main interest in the sequel

Assumption 3.1. (i) The domains $D^1_{F_t(y,z,u)} = D^1_{F_t}$ and $D^2_{F_t(y,z,u)} = D^2_{F_t}$ are independent of (ω,y,z,u).

(ii) For fixed (y,z,a,ν), F is $\mathbb{F}$-progressively measurable in $D^1_{F_t} \times D^2_{F_t}$.

(iii) The following uniform Lipschitz-type property holds. For all $(y,y',z,z',u,t,a,\nu,\omega)$

$$\left|F_t(\omega,y,z,u,a,\nu) - F_t(\omega,y',z',u,a,\nu)\right| \leq C\left(\left|y-y'\right| + \left|a^{1/2}\left(z-z'\right)\right|\right).$$

(iv) For all $(t,\omega,y,z,u^1,u^2,a,\nu)$, there exist two processes γ and γ' such that

$$\int_E \delta^{1,2}u(x)\gamma'_t(x)\nu(dx) \leq F_t(\omega,y,z,u^1,a,\nu) - F_t(\omega,y,z,u^2,a,\nu) \leq \int_E \delta^{1,2}u(x)\gamma_t(x)\nu(dx),$$

where $\delta^{1,2}u := u^1 - u^2$ and $c_1(1\wedge|x|) \leq \gamma_t(x) \leq c_2(1\wedge|x|)$ with $-1+\delta \leq c_1 \leq 0,\ c_2 \geq 0$, and $c'_1(1\wedge|x|) \leq \gamma'_t(x) \leq c'_2(1\wedge|x|)$ with $-1+\delta \leq c'_1 \leq 0,\ c'_2 \geq 0$, for some $\delta > 0$.

(v) F is uniformly continuous in ω for the $||\cdot||_\infty$ norm.

Remark 3.2. *The assumptions (i) and (ii) are classic in the second order framework ([37]). The Lipschitz assumption (iii) is standard in the BSDE theory since the paper [31]. The hypothesis (iv) allows to have a comparison theorem in the framework with jumps, it has been introduced in [35], it is also present in [2] in the form of an equality. The last hypothesis (v) is also proper to the second order framework, it is linked to our intensive use of regular conditional probability distributions in [23] to construct our solutions pathwise, thus avoiding complex issues related to negligeable sets.*

Remark 3.3. (i) *For $\kappa_1 < \kappa_2$, applying Hölder's inequality gives us*

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}\left[\left(\int_0^T \left|\widehat{F}^0_t\right|^{\kappa_1} dt\right)^{\frac{2}{\kappa_1}}\right] \leq C\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}\left[\left(\int_0^T \left|\widehat{F}^0_t\right|^{\kappa_2} dt\right)^{\frac{2}{\kappa_2}}\right],$$

where C is a constant. Then it is clear that $\mathcal{P}^\kappa_H$ is decreasing in κ.

(ii) *The Assumption 3.1, together with the fact that $\widehat{F}^0_t < +\infty$, $\mathbb{P}^{\alpha,\nu}$-a.s for every $\mathbb{P}^{\alpha,\nu} \in \mathcal{P}^\kappa_H$, implies that $\widehat{a}_t \in D^1_{F_t}$ and $\widehat{\nu}_t \in D^2_{F_t}$ $dt \times \mathbb{P}^{\alpha,\nu}$-a.s., for all $\mathbb{P}^{\alpha,\nu} \in \mathcal{P}^\kappa_H$.*

3.2 The Spaces and Norms

We now define as in [37], the spaces and norms which will be needed for the formulation of the second order BSDEs.

For $p \geq 1$, $L_H^{p,\kappa}$ denotes the space of all $\mathcal{F}_T$-measurable scalar r.v. ξ with

$$\|\xi\|^p_{L_H^{p,\kappa}} := \sup_{\mathbb{P}\in\mathcal{P}_H^\kappa} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}\left[|\xi|^p\right] < +\infty.$$

$\mathbb{H}_H^{p,\kappa}$ denotes the space of all $\mathbb{F}^+$-predictable $\mathbb{R}^d$-valued predictable processes Z with

$$\|Z\|^p_{\mathbb{H}_H^{p,\kappa}} := \sup_{\mathbb{P}\in\mathcal{P}_H^\kappa} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}\left[\left(\int_0^T |\widehat{a}_t^{1/2} Z_t|^2 dt\right)^{\frac{p}{2}}\right] < +\infty.$$

$\mathbb{D}_H^{p,\kappa}$ denotes the space of all $\mathbb{F}^+$-progressively measurable $\mathbb{R}$-valued processes Y with

$$\mathcal{P}_H^\kappa - q.s. \text{ càdlàg paths, and } \|Y\|^p_{\mathbb{D}_H^{p,\kappa}} := \sup_{\mathbb{P}\in\mathcal{P}_H^\kappa} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}\left[\sup_{0\leq t\leq T} |Y_t|^p\right] < +\infty.$$

$\mathbb{J}_H^{p,\kappa}$ denotes the space of all $\mathbb{F}^+$-predictable functions U with

$$\|U\|^p_{\mathbb{J}_H^{p,\kappa}} := \sup_{\mathbb{P}\in\mathcal{P}_H^\kappa} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}\left[\left(\int_0^T \int_E |U_s(x)|^2\, \widehat{\nu}_t(dx)ds\right)^{\frac{p}{2}}\right] < +\infty.$$

For each $\xi \in L_H^{1,\kappa}$, $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}_H^\kappa$ and $t \in [0,T]$ denote

$$\mathbb{E}_t^{H,\mathbb{P}}[\xi] := \underset{\mathbb{P}'\in\mathcal{P}_H^\kappa(t^+,\mathbb{P})}{\operatorname{ess\,sup}^{\mathbb{P}}}\ \mathbb{E}_t^{\mathbb{P}'}[\xi] \text{ where } \mathcal{P}_H^\kappa(t^+,\mathbb{P}) := \left\{\mathbb{P}' \in \mathcal{P}_H^\kappa : \mathbb{P}' = \mathbb{P} \text{ on } \mathcal{F}_t^+\right\}.$$

Then we define for each $p \geq \kappa$,

$$\mathbb{L}_H^{p,\kappa} := \left\{\xi \in L_H^{p,\kappa} : \|\xi\|_{\mathbb{L}_H^{p,\kappa}} < +\infty\right\} \text{ where } \|\xi\|^p_{\mathbb{L}_H^{p,\kappa}} := \sup_{\mathbb{P}\in\mathcal{P}_H^\kappa} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}\left[\underset{0\leq t\leq T}{\operatorname{ess\,sup}^{\mathbb{P}}} \left(\mathbb{E}_t^{H,\mathbb{P}}[|\xi|^\kappa]\right)^{\frac{p}{\kappa}}\right].$$

Remark 3.4. *$\mathbb{L}_H^{p,\kappa}$ aside, the definitions of the previous spaces are classic, but the second order framework induces the presence of an essential supremum over our family of probability measures. As for $\mathbb{L}_H^{p,\kappa}$, it appears naturally in the a priori estimates, we refer to [37] for more details.*

Finally, we denote by $\mathrm{UC}_b(\Omega)$ the collection of all bounded and uniformly continuous maps $\xi : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ with respect to the $\|\cdot\|_\infty$-norm, and we let

$$\mathcal{L}_H^{p,\kappa} := \text{the closure of } \mathrm{UC}_b(\Omega) \text{ under the norm } \|\cdot\|_{\mathbb{L}_H^{p,\kappa}}, \text{ for every } 1 < \kappa \leq p.$$

For a given probability measure $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}_H^\kappa$, the spaces $L^p(\mathbb{P})$, $\mathbb{D}^p(\mathbb{P})$, $\mathbb{H}^p(\mathbb{P})$ and $\mathbb{J}^p(\mathbb{P})$ correspond to the above spaces when the set of probability measures is only the singleton $\{\mathbb{P}\}$. Finally, we have $\mathbb{H}^p_{loc}(\mathbb{P})$ denotes the space of all $\mathbb{F}^+$-predictable $\mathbb{R}^d$-valued processes Z with

$$\left(\int_0^T \left|\widehat{a}_t^{1/2} Z_t\right|^2 dt\right)^{\frac{p}{2}} < +\infty,\ \mathbb{P} - a.s.$$

$\mathbb{J}^p_{loc}(\mathbb{P})$ denotes the space of all $\mathbb{F}^+$-predictable functions U with

$$\left(\int_0^T \int_E |U_s(x)|^2\, \widehat{\nu}_t(dx)ds\right)^{\frac{p}{2}} < +\infty,\ \mathbb{P} - a.s.$$

3.3 Formulation

We shall consider the following second order backward SDE with jumps (2BSDEJ for short), for $0 \leq t \leq T$ and $\mathcal{P}_H^\kappa$-q.s.

$$Y_t = \xi + \int_t^T \widehat{F}_s(Y_s, Z_s, U_s)ds - \int_t^T Z_s dB_s^c - \int_t^T \int_E U_s(x)\tilde{\mu}_{B^d}(ds, dx) + K_T - K_t. \quad (3.3)$$

Definition 3.2. *We say $(Y, Z, U) \in \mathbb{D}_H^{2,\kappa} \times \mathbb{H}_H^{2,\kappa} \times \mathbb{J}_H^{2,\kappa}$ is a solution to 2BSDEJ* (3.3) *if*

- *$Y_T = \xi$, $\mathcal{P}_H^\kappa$-q.s.*
- *For all $\mathbb{P} \in P_H^\kappa$ and $0 \leq t \leq T$, the process $K^\mathbb{P}$ defined below is predictable and has non-decreasing paths $\mathbb{P} - a.s.$*

$$K_t^\mathbb{P} := Y_0 - Y_t - \int_0^t \widehat{F}_s(Y_s, Z_s, U_s)ds + \int_0^t Z_s dB_s^c + \int_0^t \int_E U_s(x)\tilde{\mu}_{B^d}(ds, dx). \quad (3.4)$$

- *The family $\left\{K^\mathbb{P}, \mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}_H^\kappa\right\}$ satisfies the minimum condition*

$$K_t^\mathbb{P} = \underset{\mathbb{P}' \in \mathcal{P}_H(t^+,\mathbb{P})}{\operatorname{ess\,inf}^\mathbb{P}} \mathbb{E}_t^{\mathbb{P}'}\left[K_T^{\mathbb{P}'}\right], \ 0 \leq t \leq T, \ \mathbb{P} - a.s., \ \forall \mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}_H^\kappa. \quad (3.5)$$

Moreover if the family $\left\{K^\mathbb{P}, \mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}_H^\kappa\right\}$ can be aggregated into a universal process K, we call (Y, Z, U, K) a solution of the 2BSDEJ (3.3).

Remark 3.5. *Since with our set $\mathcal{P}_H^\kappa$ we have the aggregation property of Theorem 2.1, and since the minimum condition* (3.5) *implies easily that the family $\left\{K^\mathbb{P}, \mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}_H^\kappa\right\}$ satisfies the consistency condition, we can apply Theorem 2.1 and find an aggregator for the family. This is different from [37], because we are working with a smaller set of probability measures. Therefore, from now on, we will supress the dependence in $\mathbb{P}$ of K, when it will be clear that we are dealing with a solution to a 2BSDE.*

Following [37], in addition to Assumption 3.1, we will always assume

Assumption 3.2. (i) $\mathcal{P}_H^\kappa$ is not empty.

(ii) The process $\widehat{F}^0$ satisfy the following integrability condition

$$\phi_H^{2,\kappa} := \sup_{\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}_H^\kappa} \mathbb{E}^\mathbb{P}\left[\underset{0 \leq t \leq T}{\operatorname{ess\,sup}^\mathbb{P}} \left(\mathbb{E}_t^{H,\mathbb{P}}\left[\int_0^T |\hat{F}_s^0|^\kappa ds\right]\right)^{\frac{2}{\kappa}}\right] < +\infty \quad (3.6)$$

3.4 Connection with standard backward SDEs with jumps

Let us assume that H is linear in γ and $\tilde{v}$, in the following sense

$$H_t(y, z, u, \gamma, \tilde{v}) := \frac{1}{2}\operatorname{Tr}\left[I_d \gamma\right] + \langle \tilde{v}, \nu^* \rangle - f_t(y, z, u), \quad (3.7)$$

where $\nu^* \in \mathcal{N}$. We then have the following result

Lemma 3.1. *If H is of the form (3.7), then $D^1_{F_t} = \{I_d\}$, $D^2_{F_t} = \{\nu^*\}$ and*

$$F_t(\omega, y, z, u, a, \nu) = F_t(\omega, y, z, u, Id, \nu^*) = f_t(y, z, u).$$

Proof. First notice that

$$\begin{aligned} H_t(\omega, y, z, u, \gamma, \tilde{v}) = &\sup_{(a,\nu)\in\mathbb{S}_d^{>0}\times\mathcal{N}} \left\{\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Tr}(a\gamma) + \int_0^T \int_E \tilde{v}(e)\nu_s(\omega)(ds, de) - \delta_{Id}(a) - \delta_{\nu^*}(\nu)\right\} \\ &- f_t(y, z, u). \end{aligned}$$

where δ_A denotes the characteristic function of a subset A in the convex analysis sense.

By definition of F, we get

$$F_t(\omega, y, z, u, a, \nu) = f_t(y, z, u) + H^{**}(a, \nu),$$

where H^{**} is the double Fenchel-Legendre transform of the function

$$(a, \nu) \mapsto \delta_{Id}(a) + \delta_{\nu^*}(\nu),$$

which is convex and lower-semicontinuous.

This then implies that

$$F_t(\omega, y, z, u, a, \nu) = f_t(y, z, u) + \delta_{Id}(a) + \delta_{\nu^*}(\nu),$$

which is the desired result. □

If we further assume that $\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}_{\nu^*}}\left[\int_0^T |f_t(0,0,0)|^2\,dt\right] < +\infty$, then $\mathcal{P}^\kappa_H = \{\mathbb{P}_{\nu^*}\}$ and the minimality condition on $K = K^{\mathbb{P}_{\nu^*}}$ implies that $0 = \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}_{\nu^*}}[K_T]$, which means that $K = 0$, $\mathbb{P}_{\nu^*}$-a.s. and the 2BSDEJ is reduced to a classical backward SDE with jumps.

3.5 Connection with G-expectations and G-Lévy processes

3.5.1 Reminder on G-Lévy processes

In a recent paper [18], Hu and Peng introduced a new class of processes with independent and stationary increments, called G-Lévy processes. This processes are defined intrinsiquely, i.e. without making reference to any probability measure.

Let $\widetilde{\Omega}$ be a given set and let $\mathcal{H}$ be a linear space of real valued functions defined on $\widetilde{\Omega}$, containing the constants and such that $|X| \in \mathcal{H}$ if $X \in \mathcal{H}$. A sublinear expectation is a functional $\hat{\mathbb{E}} : \mathcal{H} \to \mathbb{R}$ which is monotone increasing, constant preserving, sub-additive and positively homogeneous. We refer to Definition 1.1 of [33] for more details. The triple $(\widetilde{\Omega}, \mathcal{H}, \hat{\mathbb{E}})$ is called a sublinear expectation space.

Definition 3.3. *A d-dimensional cadlag process $\{X_t,\, t \geq 0\}$ defined on a sublinear expectation space $(\widetilde{\Omega}, \mathcal{H}, \hat{\mathbb{E}})$ is called a G-Lévy process if:*

(i) $X_0 = 0$.

(ii) *X has independent increments: $\forall s,t>0$, the random variable $(X_{t+s}-X_t)$ is independent from $(X_{t_1},\dots,X_{t_n})$, for each $n\in\mathbb{N}$ and $0\le t_1<\cdots<t_n\le t$. The notion of independence used here corresponds to definition 3.10 in [33].*

(iii) *X has stationary increments: $\forall s,t>0$, the distribution of $(X_{t+s}-X_t)$ does not depend on t. The notion of distribution used here corresponds to the definition given in §3 of [33].*

(iv) *For each $t\ge 0$, there exists a decomposition $X_t=X_t^c+X_t^d$, where $\{X_t^c,\ t\ge 0\}$ is a continuous process and $\{X_t^d,\ t\ge 0\}$ is a pure jump process.*

(v) *(X_t^c,X_t^d) is a $2d$-dimensional process satisfying conditions (i), (ii) and (iii) of this definition and*

$$\lim_{t\to 0^+}\frac{1}{t}\hat{\mathbb{E}}\left(|X_t^c|^3\right)=0,\ \ \hat{\mathbb{E}}\left(\left|X_t^d\right|\right)\le Ct,\ t\ge 0$$

for a real constant C.

In [18], Hu and Peng proved the following Lévy-Khintchine representation for G-Lévy processes:

Theorem 3.1 (Hu et Peng [18])**.** *Let $\{X_t,\ t\ge 0\}$ be a G-Lévy process. Then for each Lipschitz and bounded function φ, the function u defined by $u(t,x):=\hat{\mathbb{E}}\left(\varphi[x+X_t]\right)$ is the unique viscosity solution of the following partial integro-differential equation:*

$$\partial_t u(t,x)-\sup_{(b,\alpha,\nu)\in\mathcal{U}}\left\{\int_E[u(t,x+z)-u(t,x)]\nu(dz)+<Du(t,x),B>\right.$$
$$\left.+\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Tr}\left[D^2u(t,x)\alpha\alpha^T\right]\right\}=0$$

where $\mathcal{U}$ is a subset of $\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{R}^{d\times d}\times\mathcal{M}_R^+$ satisfying

$$\sup_{(b,\alpha,\nu)\in\mathcal{U}}\left\{\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}|z|\,\nu(dz)+|b|+\mathrm{Tr}\left[\alpha\alpha^T\right]\right\}<+\infty$$

and where $\mathcal{M}_R^+$ denotes the set of positive Radon measures on E.

Notice that Hu and Peng study the case of G-Lévy processes with a discontinuous part that is of finite variation.

3.5.2 A connection with a particular 2BSDEJ

In our framework, we know that B^d is a purely discontinuous semimartingale of finite variation under $\mathbb{P}_\nu$ if $\int_0^T\int_{|x|\le 1}|x|\,\nu_s(dx)ds<+\infty$, $\mathbb{P}_\nu$-a.s. We give a function H below, that is the natural candidate to retrieve the example of G-Lévy processes in our context. This is one of the points of our accompanying paper [24].

Let $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}$ be any subset of $\mathcal{N}$ that is convex and closed for the weak topology on $\mathcal{M}_R^+$. We define

$$H_t(\omega,\gamma,\tilde{v}) := \sup_{(a,\nu)\in\mathbb{S}_d^{>0}\times\mathcal{N}} \left\{ \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Tr}(a\gamma) + \int_0^T\int_E \tilde{v}(e)\nu_s(de)ds - \delta_{[a_1,a_2]}(a) - \delta_{\tilde{\mathcal{N}}}(\nu) \right\}.$$

Since $[a_1,a_2]$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{N}}$ are closed convex spaces, $F_t(\omega,a,\nu)$ is the double Fenchel-Legendre transform in (a,ν) of the convex and lower semi-continuous function $(a,\nu)\mapsto \delta_{[a_1,a_2]}(a)+\delta_{\tilde{\mathcal{N}}}(\nu)$ and then

$$F_t(\omega,a,\nu) = \delta_{[a_1,a_2]}(a)+\delta_{\tilde{\mathcal{N}}}(\nu).$$

In [24], we prove that the second order BSDEs with jumps are connected to a class of fully non linear partial integro-differential equations. With this particular function H and its transform F, the PIDE we find is the one given in Theorem 3.1. If moreover $H_t(\omega,\gamma,\tilde{v}) = H_t(\omega,\tilde{v})$ is independent of γ, and $\tilde{\mathcal{N}} = \{\lambda\delta_{\{1\}},\ \lambda_1\leq\lambda\leq\lambda_2\}$ (which is convex and closed), then F_t is independent of a and we obtain a 2BSDEJ giving a representation of the G-Poisson process.

4 Uniqueness result

4.1 Representation of the solution

We have similarly as in Theorem 4.4 of [37]

Theorem 4.1. *Let Assumptions 3.1 and 3.2 hold. Assume $\xi\in\mathbb{L}_H^{2,\kappa}$ and that (Y,Z,U) is a solution to 2BSDE with jumps* (3.3)*. Then, for any $\mathbb{P}\in\mathcal{P}_H^\kappa$ and $0\leq t_1<t_2\leq T$,*

$$Y_{t_1} = \operatorname*{ess\,sup}^{\mathbb{P}}_{\mathbb{P}'\in\mathcal{P}_H^\kappa(t_1^+,\mathbb{P})} y_{t_1}^{\mathbb{P}'}(t_2,Y_{t_2}),\ \mathbb{P}-a.s., \tag{4.1}$$

where, for any $\mathbb{P}\in\mathcal{P}_H^\kappa$, $\mathbb{F}^+$-stopping time τ, and $\mathcal{F}_\tau^+$-measurable random variable $\xi\in\mathbb{L}^2(\mathbb{P})$, $(y^{\mathbb{P}}(\tau,\xi),z^{\mathbb{P}}(\tau,\xi))$ denotes the solution to the following standard BSDE on $0\leq t\leq\tau$

$$y_t^{\mathbb{P}} = \xi - \int_t^\tau \widehat{F}_s(y_s^{\mathbb{P}},z_s^{\mathbb{P}},u_s^{\mathbb{P}})ds + \int_t^\tau z_s^{\mathbb{P}}dB_s^c + \int_t^\tau\int_E u_s^{\mathbb{P}}(x)\tilde{\mu}_{B^d}(ds,\ dx),\ \mathbb{P}-a.s. \tag{4.2}$$

Remark 4.1. *We first emphasize that existence and uniqueness results for the standard BSDEs* (4.2) *are not given directly by the existing litterature, since the compensator of the counting measure associated to the jumps of B is not deterministic. However, since all the probability measure we consider satisfy the martingale representation property and the Blumenthal $0-1$ law, it is clear that we can straightforwardly generalize the proof of existence and uniqueness of Li and Tang [40] (see also [3] and [11] for related results). Furthermore, the usual a priori estimates and comparison Theorems will also hold.*

Remark 4.2. *It is worth noticing that, unlike in the case of 2BSDEs (see [37] for example), this representation does not imply directly the uniquemess of the solution in $\mathbb{D}_H^{2,\kappa}\times\mathbb{H}_H^{2,\kappa}\times\mathbb{J}_H^{2,\kappa}$. Indeed, by taking $t_2=T$ in this representation formula, we have*

$$Y_t = \operatorname*{ess\,sup}^{\mathbb{P}}_{\mathbb{P}'\in\mathcal{P}_H^\kappa(t^+,\mathbb{P})} y_t^{\mathbb{P}'}(T,\xi),\ t\in[0,T],\ \mathbb{P}-a.s.,\ \textit{for all } \mathbb{P}\in\mathcal{P}_H^\kappa,$$

and thus Y is unique.

Then, since we have that $d\langle Y^c, B^c\rangle_t = Z_t d\langle B^c\rangle_t$, $\mathcal{P}_H^\kappa - q.s.$, Z is unique. However, here we are not able to obtain that U and $K^{\mathbb{P}}$ are uniquely determined. Nonetheless, this representation is necessary to prove some a priori estimates in Theorem 4.4 which, as for the standard BSDEJs, insure the uniqueness of the solution.

Before giving the proof of the above theorem, we first state the following Lemma which is a generalization of the usual comparison theorem proved by Royer (see Theorem 2.5 in [35]). Its proof is a straightforward generalization so we omit it.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}_H^\kappa$. We consider two generators f^1 and f^2 satisfying Assumption H_{comp} in [35] (which is a consequence of our more restrictive assumptions). Given two non-decreasing processes k^1 and k^2, let ξ^1 and ξ^2 be two terminal conditions for the following BSDEJs for $i = 1, 2$,*

$$y_t^i = \xi^i + \int_t^T f_s^i(y_s^i, z_s^i, u_s^i)ds - \int_t^T z_s^i dW_s - \int_t^T \int_E u_s^i(x)\tilde{\mu}(ds,\ dx) + k_T^i - k_t^i,\ \ \mathbb{P} - a.s.$$

Denote by (y^1, z^1, u^1) and (y^2, z^2, u^2) the respective solutions. If $\xi^1 \leq \xi^2$, $k^1 - k^2$ is non-increasing and $f^1(t, y_t^1, z_t^1, u_t^1) \leq f^2(t, y_t^1, z_t^1, u_t^1)$, then $\forall t \in [0, T], Y_t^1 \leq Y_t^2$.

Proof of Theorem 4.1 The proof follows the lines of the proof of Theorem 4.4 in [37].

(i) Fix $0 \leq t_1 < t_2 \leq T$ and $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}_H^\kappa$. For any $\mathbb{P}^{'} \in \mathcal{P}_H^\kappa(t_1^+, \mathbb{P})$ and $t_1 \leq t \leq t_2$, we have,

$$\begin{aligned} Y_t =& Y_{t_2} + \int_t^{t_2} \widehat{F}_s(Y_s, Z_s, U_s)ds - \int_t^{t_2} Z_s dB_s^c - \int_t^{t_2}\int_E U_s(x)\tilde{\mu}_{B^d}(ds, dx) \\ &+ K_{t_2} - K_t,\ \mathbb{P}^{'} - a.s., \end{aligned}$$

where K is the aggregator for the family of non-decreasing processes.

With Assumption 3.1, we can apply the above Lemma 4.1 under $\mathbb{P}^{'}$ to obtain $Y_{t_1} \geq y_{t_1}^{\mathbb{P}^{'}}(t_2, Y_{t_2})$, $\mathbb{P}^{'} - a.s.$. Since $\mathbb{P}^{'} = \mathbb{P}$ on $\mathcal{F}_{t_1}^+$, we get $Y_{t_1} \geq y_{t_1}^{\mathbb{P}^{'}}(t_2, Y_{t_2})$, $\mathbb{P} - a.s.$ and thus

$$Y_{t_1} \geq \underset{\mathbb{P}^{'} \in \mathcal{P}_H^\kappa(t_1^+, \mathbb{P})}{\operatorname{ess\,sup}^{\mathbb{P}}}\ y_{t_1}^{\mathbb{P}^{'}}(t_2, Y_{t_2}),\ \mathbb{P} - a.s.$$

(ii) We now prove the reverse inequality. Fix $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}_H^\kappa$. We will show in (iii) below that

$$C_{t_1}^{\mathbb{P}} := \underset{\mathbb{P}^{'} \in \mathcal{P}_H^\kappa(t_1^+, \mathbb{P})}{\operatorname{ess\,sup}^{\mathbb{P}}}\ \mathbb{E}_{t_1}^{\mathbb{P}^{'}}\left[(K_{t_2} - K_{t_1})^2\right] < +\infty,\ \mathbb{P} - a.s.$$

For every $\mathbb{P}^{'} \in \mathcal{P}_H^\kappa(t^+, \mathbb{P})$, denote

$$\delta Y := Y - y^{\mathbb{P}^{'}}(t_2, Y_{t_2}),\ \delta Z := Z - z^{\mathbb{P}^{'}}(t_2, Y_{t_2}) \text{ and } \delta U := U - u^{\mathbb{P}^{'}}(t_2, Y_{t_2}).$$

By the Lipschitz Assumption 3.1(iii), there exist two bounded processes λ and η such that for all $t_1 \leq t \leq t_2$,

$$\begin{aligned}\delta Y_t = & \int_t^{t_2} \left(\lambda_s \delta Y_s + \eta_s \widehat{a}_s^{1/2} \delta Z_s\right) ds + \int_t^{t_2} \left(\widehat{F}_s(y_s^{\mathbb{P}'}, z_s^{\mathbb{P}'}, U_s) - \widehat{F}_s(y_s^{\mathbb{P}'}, z_s^{\mathbb{P}'}, u_s^{\mathbb{P}'})\right) ds \\ & - \int_t^{t_2} \delta Z_s dB_s^c - \int_t^{t_2} \int_E \delta U_s(x) \tilde{\mu}_{B^d}(ds, dx) + K_{t_2} - K_t,\ \mathbb{P}' - a.s.\end{aligned}$$

Define for $t_1 \leq t \leq t_2$ the following processes

$$N_t := \int_{t_1}^t \eta_s \widehat{a}_s^{-1/2} dB_s^c + \int_{t_1}^t \int_E \gamma_s(x) \tilde{\mu}_{B^d}(ds,\ dx),$$

and

$$M_t := \exp\left(\int_{t_1}^t \lambda_s ds\right) \mathcal{E}(N)_t,$$

where $\mathcal{E}(N)_t$ denotes the Doléans-Dade exponential martingale of N_t.

By the boundedness of λ and η and the assumption on γ in Assumption 3.1(iv), we know that M has moments (positive or negative) of any order (see [26] for the positive moments and Lemma A.4 in the Appendix for the negative ones). Thus we have for $p \geq 1$

$$\mathbb{E}_{t_1}^{\mathbb{P}'} \left[\sup_{t_1 \leq t \leq t_2} M_t^p + \sup_{t_1 \leq t \leq t_2} M_t^{-p}\right] \leq C_p,\ \mathbb{P}' - a.s. \tag{4.3}$$

Then, by Itô's formula, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}d(M_t \delta Y_t) = & M_{t-} d(\delta Y_t) + \delta Y_{t-} dM_t + d\,[M, \delta Y]_t \\ = & M_{t-} \Big[\left(-\lambda_t \delta Y_t - \eta_t \widehat{a}_t^{1/2} \delta Z_t - \widehat{F}_t(y_t^{\mathbb{P}'}, z_t^{\mathbb{P}'}, U_t) + \widehat{F}_t(y_t^{\mathbb{P}'}, z_t^{\mathbb{P}'}, u_t^{\mathbb{P}'})\right) dt \\ & + \delta Z_t dB_t^c + \int_E \left(\delta U_t(x) + \gamma_t(x) \delta U_t(x)\right) \tilde{\mu}_{B^d}(dt, dx)\Big] \\ & + \delta Y_{t-} M_{t-} \left(\lambda_t dt + \eta_t \widehat{a}_t^{-1/2} dB_t^c + \int_E \gamma_t(x) \tilde{\mu}_{B^d}(dt, dx)\right) \\ & + M_t \left(\eta_t \widehat{a}_t^{1/2} \delta Z_t dt + \int_E \gamma_t(x) \delta U_t(x) \widehat{\nu}_t(dx) dt\right) - M_{t-} dK_t.\end{aligned}$$

Thus, by Assumption 3.1(iv), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\delta Y_{t_1} \leq & - \int_{t_1}^{t_2} M_s \left(\delta Z_s + \delta Y_s \eta_s \widehat{a}_s^{-1/2}\right) dB_s^c + \int_{t_1}^{t_2} M_{s-} dK_s \\ & - \int_{t_1}^{t_2} M_{s-} \int_E \left(\delta U_s(x) + \delta Y_s \gamma_s(x) + \gamma_s(x) \delta U_s(x)\right) \tilde{\mu}_{B^d}(ds, dx).\end{aligned}$$

By taking conditional expectation, we obtain

$$\delta Y_{t_1} \leq \mathbb{E}_{t_1}^{\mathbb{P}'} \left[\int_{t_1}^{t_2} M_{t-} dK_t\right]. \tag{4.4}$$

Applying the Hölder inequality, we can now write

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta Y_{t_1} &\le \mathbb{E}_{t_1}^{\mathbb{P}'}\left[\sup_{t_1\le t\le t_2}(M_t)\left(K_{t_2}^{\mathbb{P}'}-K_{t_1}^{\mathbb{P}'}\right)\right]\\
&\le \left(\mathbb{E}_{t_1}^{\mathbb{P}'}\left[\sup_{t_1\le t\le t_2}(M_t)^3\right]\right)^{1/3}\left(\mathbb{E}_{t_1}^{\mathbb{P}'}\left[\left(K_{t_2}^{\mathbb{P}'}-K_{t_1}^{\mathbb{P}'}\right)^{3/2}\right]\right)^{2/3}\\
&\le C(C_{t_1}^{\mathbb{P}})^{1/3}\left(\mathbb{E}_{t_1}^{\mathbb{P}'}\left[K_{t_2}-K_{t_1}\right]\right)^{1/3},\ \mathbb{P}-a.s.
\end{aligned}$$

Taking the essential infimum on both sides finishes the proof.

(iii) It remains to show that the estimate for $C_{t_1}^{\mathbb{P}}$ holds. But by definition, and the Lipschitz Assumption on F we clearly have

$$\sup_{\mathbb{P}\in\mathcal{P}_H^\kappa}\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}\left[(K_{t_2}-K_{t_1})^2\right]\le C\left(\|Y\|^2_{\mathbb{D}_H^{2,\kappa}}+\|Z\|^2_{\mathbb{H}_H^{2,\kappa}}+\|U\|^2_{\mathbb{J}_H^{2,\kappa}}+\phi_H^{2,\kappa}\right)<+\infty, \tag{4.5}$$

since the last term on the right-hand side is finite thanks to the integrability assumed on ξ and $\widehat{F}^0$. We then use the definition of the essential supremum (see Neveu [29] for example) to have the following equality

$$\operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\mathbb{P}'\in\mathcal{P}_H^\kappa(t_1^+,\mathbb{P})}{}^{\mathbb{P}}\ \mathbb{E}_{t_1}^{\mathbb{P}'}\left[(K_{t_2}-K_{t_1})^2\right]=\sup_{n\ge1}\mathbb{E}_{t_1}^{\mathbb{P}_n}\left[(K_{t_2}-K_{t_1})^2\right],\ \mathbb{P}-a.s. \tag{4.6}$$

for some sequence $(\mathbb{P}_n)_{n\ge1}\subset\mathcal{P}_H^\kappa(t_1^+,\mathbb{P})$. Morevoer, in Lemma A.1 of the Appendix, it is proved that the set $\mathcal{P}_H^\kappa(t_1^+,\mathbb{P})$ is upward directed which means that for any $\mathbb{P}_1^{'},\ \mathbb{P}_2^{'}\in\mathcal{P}_H^\kappa(t_1^+,\mathbb{P})$, there exists $\mathbb{P}^{'}\in\mathcal{P}_H^\kappa(t_1^+,\mathbb{P})$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}_{t_1}^{\mathbb{P}'}\left[(K_{t_2}-K_{t_1})^2\right]=\max\left\{\mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{t_1}}^{\mathbb{P}_1'}\left[(\mathrm{K_{t_2}}-\mathrm{K_{t_1}})^2\right],\ \mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{t_1}}^{\mathbb{P}_2'}\left[(\mathrm{K_{t_2}}-\mathrm{K_{t_1}})^2\right]\right\}.$$

Hence, by using a subsequence if necessary, we can rewrite (4.6) as

$$\operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\mathbb{P}'\in\mathcal{P}_H^\kappa(t_1^+,\mathbb{P})}{}^{\mathbb{P}}\ \mathbb{E}_{t_1}^{\mathbb{P}'}\left[(K_{t_2}-K_{t_1})^2\right]=\lim_{n\to\infty}\uparrow\mathbb{E}_{t_1}^{\mathbb{P}_n}\left[(K_{t_2}-K_{t_1})^2\right],\ \mathbb{P}-a.s.$$

With (4.5), we can then finish the proof exactly as in the proof of Theorem 4.4 in [37]. □

Finally, the comparison Theorem below follows easily from the classical one for BSDEJs (see for instance Theorem 2.5 in [35]) and the representation (4.1).

Theorem 4.2. *Let (Y,Z,U) and (Y',Z',U') be the solutions of 2BSDEJs with terminal conditions ξ and $\xi^{'}$, generators $\widehat{F}$ and $\widehat{F}^{'}$ respectively (with the corresponding function H and $H^{'}$), and let $(y^{\mathbb{P}},z^{\mathbb{P}},u^{\mathbb{P}})$ and $(y'^{\mathbb{P}},z'^{\mathbb{P}},u'^{\mathbb{P}})$ the solutions of the associated BSDEJs. Assume that they both verify our Assumptions 3.1 and 3.2 and that we have*

- $\mathcal{P}_H^\kappa\subset\mathcal{P}_{H'}^\kappa$.
- $\xi\le\xi^{'}$, $\mathcal{P}_H^\kappa-q.s.$
- $\widehat{F}_t(y_t'^{\mathbb{P}},z_t'^{\mathbb{P}},u_t'^{\mathbb{P}})\le\widehat{F}_t^{'}(y_t'^{\mathbb{P}},z_t'^{\mathbb{P}},u_t'^{\mathbb{P}})$, $\mathbb{P}-a.s.$, *for all* $\mathbb{P}\in\mathcal{P}_H^\kappa$.

Then $Y\le Y'$, $\mathcal{P}_H^\kappa-q.s.$

4.2 A priori estimates and uniqueness of the solution

We conclude this section by showing some a priori estimates which not only will imply uniqueness of the solution of the 2BSDEJ (3.3), but will be useful to obtain the existence of a solution in [23].

Theorem 4.3. *Let Assumptions 3.1 and 3.2 hold. Assume* $\xi \in \mathbb{L}^{2,\kappa}_H$ *and* $(Y,Z,U) \in \mathbb{D}^{2,\kappa}_H \times \mathbb{H}^{2,\kappa}_H \times \mathbb{J}^{2,\kappa}_H$ *is a solution to the 2BSDEJ* (3.3)*. Let* $\left\{(y^{\mathbb{P}}, z^{\mathbb{P}}, u^{\mathbb{P}})\right\}_{\mathbb{P}\in\mathcal{P}^\kappa_H}$ *be the solutions of the corresponding BSDEJs* (4.2)*. Then, there exists a constant* C_κ *such that*

$$\|Y\|^2_{\mathbb{D}^{2,\kappa}_H} + \|Z\|^2_{\mathbb{H}^{2,\kappa}_H} + \|U\|^2_{\mathbb{J}^{2,\kappa}_H} + \sup_{\mathbb{P}\in\mathcal{P}^\kappa_H} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}\left[|K_T|^2\right] \leq C_\kappa\left(\|\xi\|^2_{\mathbb{L}^{2,\kappa}_H} + \phi^{2,\kappa}_H\right)$$

$$\sup_{\mathbb{P}\in\mathcal{P}^\kappa_H}\left\{\left\|y^{\mathbb{P}}\right\|^2_{\mathbb{D}^2(\mathbb{P})} + \left\|z^{\mathbb{P}}\right\|^2_{\mathbb{H}^2(\mathbb{P})} + \left\|u^{\mathbb{P}}\right\|^2_{\mathbb{J}^2(\mathbb{P})}\right\} \leq C_\kappa\left(\|\xi\|^2_{\mathbb{L}^{2,\kappa}_H} + \phi^{2,\kappa}_H\right).$$

Proof. As in the proof of the representation formula in Theorem 4.1, the Lipschitz assumption 3.1(iii) of F implies that there exist two bounded processes λ and η such that for all t, and $\mathbb{P}-a.s.$

$$y^{\mathbb{P}}_t = \xi + \int_t^T \left(\lambda_s y^{\mathbb{P}}_s + \eta_s \widehat{a}^{1/2}_s z^{\mathbb{P}}_s + \widehat{F}_s(0,0,u^{\mathbb{P}}_s)\right) ds - \int_t^T z^{\mathbb{P}}_s dB^c_s - \int_t^T \int_E u^{\mathbb{P}}_s(x)\tilde{\mu}_{B^d}(ds,dx).$$

Define the following processes

$$N_t := \int_t^T \eta_s \widehat{a}^{-1/2}_s dB^c_s + \int_t^T \int_E \gamma_s(x)\tilde{\mu}_{B^d}(ds,dx), \text{ and } M_t := \exp\left(\int_t^T \lambda_s ds\right)\mathcal{E}(N)_t,$$

where $\mathcal{E}(N)_t$ denotes the Doléans-Dade exponential martingale of N_t. Then by applying Itô's formula to $M_t y^{\mathbb{P}}_t$, we obtain

$$y^{\mathbb{P}}_t = \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}_t\left[M_T\xi + \int_t^T M_s\widehat{F}_s(0,0,u^{\mathbb{P}}_s)ds - \int_t^T\int_E M_s\gamma_s(x)u^{\mathbb{P}}_s(x)\widehat{\nu}_s(dx)ds\right].$$

Finally with Assumption (3.1)(iv), the Hölder inequality and the inequality (4.3), we conclude that there exists a constant C_κ depending only on κ, T and the Lipschitz constant of F, such that for all $\mathbb{P}$

$$\left|y^{\mathbb{P}}_t\right| \leq C_\kappa \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}_t\left[|\xi|^\kappa + \int_t^T \left|\widehat{F}^0_s\right|^\kappa ds\right]^{1/\kappa}. \tag{4.7}$$

This immediately provides the estimate for $y^{\mathbb{P}}$. Now by definition of our norms, we get from (4.7) and the representation formula (4.1) that

$$\|Y\|^2_{\mathbb{D}^{2,\kappa}_H} \leq C_\kappa\left(\|\xi\|^2_{\mathbb{L}^{2,\kappa}_H} + \phi^{2,\kappa}_H\right). \tag{4.8}$$

Now apply Itô's formula to $|Y|^2$ under each $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}_H^\kappa$. We get as usual for every $\epsilon > 0$

$$\begin{aligned}
&|Y_0|^2 + \int_0^T \left|\widehat{a}_t^{1/2} Z_t\right|^2 dt + \int_0^T \int_E |U_t(x)|^2 \, \widehat{\nu}_t(dx)dt \\
&= |\xi|^2 + 2\int_0^T Y_t \widehat{F}_t(Y_t, Z_t, U_t)dt + 2\int_0^T Y_{t^-} dK_t \\
&\quad - 2\int_0^T Y_t Z_t dB_t^c - \int_0^T \int_E \left(|U_t(x)|^2 + 2Y_{t^-} U_t(x)\right) \tilde{\mu}_{B^d}(dt, dx) \\
&\leq 2\int_0^T |Y_t| \, |\widehat{F}_t(Y_t, Z_t, U_t)| dt + 2 \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |Y_t| \, K_T \\
&\quad - 2\int_0^T Y_t Z_t dB_t^c - \int_0^T \int_E \left(|U_t(x)|^2 + 2Y_{t^-} U_t(x)\right) \tilde{\mu}_{B^d}(dt, dx).
\end{aligned}$$

By our assumptions on F, we have

$$\left|\widehat{F}_t(Y_t, Z_t, U_t)\right| \leq C\left(|Y_t| + \left|\widehat{a}_t^{1/2} Z_t\right| + \left|\widehat{F}_t^0\right| + \left(\int_E |U_t(x)|^2 \, \widehat{\nu}_t(dx)\right)^{1/2}\right).$$

With the usual inequality $2ab \leq \frac{1}{\epsilon}a^2 + \epsilon b^2, \forall \epsilon > 0$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}\left[\int_0^T \left|\widehat{a}_t^{1/2} Z_t\right|^2 dt + \int_0^T \int_E |U_t(x)|^2 \, \widehat{\nu}_t(dx)dt\right] \\
&\leq C\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}\left[|\xi|^2 + \int_0^T |Y_t| \left(\left|\widehat{F}_t^0\right| + |Y_t| + \left|\widehat{a}_t^{1/2} Z_t\right| + \left(\int_E |U_t(x)|^2 \, \widehat{\nu}_t(dx)\right)^{1/2}\right) dt\right] \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}\left[\int_0^T |Y_{t^-}| \, dK_t\right] \\
&\leq C\left(\|\xi\|_{\mathbb{L}_H^{2,\kappa}} + \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}\left[\left(1 + \frac{C}{\varepsilon}\right) \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |Y_t|^2 + \left(\int_0^T \left|\widehat{F}_t^0\right| dt\right)^2\right]\right) \\
&\quad + \epsilon \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}\left[\int_0^T \left|\widehat{a}_t^{1/2} Z_t\right|^2 dt + \int_0^T \int_E |U_t(x)|^2 \, \widehat{\nu}_t(dx)dt + |K_T|^2\right]. \qquad (4.9)
\end{aligned}$$

Then by definition of our 2BSDEJ, we easily have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}\left[|K_T|^2\right] \leq & C_0 \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}\left[|\xi|^2 + \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |Y_t|^2 + \int_0^T \left|\widehat{a}_t^{1/2} Z_t\right|^2 dt\right. \\
&\left. + \int_0^T \int_E |U_t(x)|^2 \, \widehat{\nu}_t(dx)dt + \left(\int_0^T \left|\widehat{F}_t^0\right| dt\right)^2\right], \qquad (4.10)
\end{aligned}$$

for some constant C_0, independent of ϵ. Now set $\epsilon := (2(1 + C_0))^{-1}$ and plug (4.10) in (4.9). One then gets

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}\left[\int_0^T |\widehat{a}_t^{\frac{1}{2}} Z_t|^2 dt + \int_0^T \int_E |U_t(x)|^2 \, \widehat{\nu}_t(dx)dt\right] \leq C\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}\left[|\xi|^2 + \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} |Y_t|^2 + \left(\int_0^T \left|\widehat{F}_t^0\right| dt\right)^2\right].$$

From this and the estimate for Y, we immediately obtain

$$\|Z\|_{\mathbb{H}_H^{2,\kappa}} + \|U\|_{\mathbb{J}_H^{2,\kappa}} \leq C\left(\|\xi\|_{\mathbb{L}_H^{2,\kappa}}^2 + \phi_H^{2,\kappa}\right).$$

Then the estimate for K follows from (4.10). The estimates for $z^{\mathbb{P}}$ and $u^{\mathbb{P}}$ can be proved similarly. $\square$

Theorem 4.4. *Let Assumptions 3.1 and 3.2 hold. For $i = 1, 2$, let us consider the solutions (Y^i, Z^i, U^i, K^i) of the 2BSDEJs (3.3) with terminal condition ξ^i. Then, there exists a constant C_κ depending only on κ, T and the Lipschitz constant of F such that*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|Y^1 - Y^2\right\|_{\mathbb{D}^{2,\kappa}_H} \leq C_\kappa \left\|\xi^1 - \xi^2\right\|_{\mathbb{L}^{2,\kappa}_H} \\
&\left\|Z^1 - Z^2\right\|^2_{\mathbb{H}^{2,\kappa}_H} + \sup_{\mathbb{P}\in\mathcal{P}^\kappa_H} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}\left[\sup_{0\leq t\leq T}\left|K^1_t - K^2_t\right|^2\right] + \left\|U^1 - U^2\right\|^2_{\mathbb{J}^{2,\kappa}_H} \\
&\leq C_\kappa \left\|\xi^1 - \xi^2\right\|_{\mathbb{L}^{2,\kappa}_H}\left(\left\|\xi^1\right\|_{\mathbb{L}^{2,\kappa}_H} + \left\|\xi^2\right\|_{\mathbb{L}^{2,\kappa}_H} + (\phi^{2,\kappa}_H)^{1/2}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Consequently, the 2BSDEJ (3.3) has at most one solution in $\mathbb{D}^{2,\kappa}_H \times \mathbb{H}^{2,\kappa}_H \times \mathbb{J}^{2,\kappa}_H$.

Proof. As in the previous Theorem, we can obtain that there exists a constant C_κ depending only on κ, T and the Lipschitz constant of $\widehat{F}$, such that for all $\mathbb{P}$

$$\left|y^{\mathbb{P},1}_t - y^{\mathbb{P},2}_t\right| \leq C_\kappa \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}_t\left[\left|\xi^1 - \xi^2\right|^\kappa\right]^{1/\kappa}. \tag{4.11}$$

Now by definition, we get from (4.11) and the representation formula (4.1) that

$$\left\|Y^1 - Y^2\right\|^2_{\mathbb{D}^{2,\kappa}_H} \leq C_\kappa \left\|\xi^1 - \xi^2\right\|^2_{\mathbb{L}^{2,\kappa}_H}. \tag{4.12}$$

Applying Itô's formula to $\left|Y^1 - Y^2\right|^2$, under each $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}^\kappa_H$, leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}\left[\int_0^T \left|\widehat{a}_t^{\frac{1}{2}}(Z^1_t - Z^2_t)\right|^2 dt + \int_0^T\int_E \left|U^1_t(x) - U^2_t(x)\right|^2 \widehat{\nu}_t(dx)dt\right] \\
&\leq C\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}\left[\left|\xi^1 - \xi^2\right|^2\right] + \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}\left[\int_0^T \left|Y^1_t - Y^2_t\right| d(K^1_t - K^2_t)\right] \\
&\quad + C\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}\Big[\int_0^T \left|Y^1_t - Y^2_t\right|\Big(\left|Y^1_t - Y^2_t\right| + |\widehat{a}_t^{\frac{1}{2}}(Z^1_t - Z^2_t)| \\
&\quad + \left(\int_E \left|U^1_t(x) - U^2_t(x)\right|^2 \widehat{\nu}_t(dx)dt\right)^{1/2}\Big) dt\Big] \\
&\leq C\left(\left\|\xi^1 - \xi^2\right\|^2_{\mathbb{L}^{2,\kappa}_H} + \left\|Y^1 - Y^2\right\|^2_{\mathbb{D}^{2,\kappa}_H}\right) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}\left[\int_0^T \left|\widehat{a}_t^{1/2}(Z^1_t - Z^2_t)\right|^2 dt + \int_0^T\int_E \left|U^1_t(x) - U^2_t(x)\right|^2 \widehat{\nu}_t(dx)dt\right] \\
&\quad + C\left\|Y^1 - Y^2\right\|_{\mathbb{D}^{2,\kappa}_H}\left(\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}\left[\sum_{i=1}^2 \left(K^i_T\right)^2\right]\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

The estimates for $(Z^1 - Z^2)$ and $(U^1 - U^2)$ are now obvious from the above inequality and the estimates of Theorem 4.3. Finally the estimate for the difference of the increasing processes is obvious by definition. $\square$

A Appendix

A.1 The measures $\mathbb{P}^{\alpha,\nu}$

Lemma A.1. *Fix an arbitrary measure* $\mathbb{P} = \mathbb{P}^{\alpha,\nu}$ *in* $\mathcal{P}_H^\kappa$. *The set* $\mathcal{P}_H^\kappa(t^+,\mathbb{P})$ *is upward directed, i.e. for each* $\mathbb{P}_1 := \mathbb{P}^{\alpha_1,\nu_1}$ *and* $\mathbb{P}_2 := \mathbb{P}^{\alpha_2,\nu_2}$ *in* $\mathcal{P}_H^\kappa(t^+,\mathbb{P})$, *there exists* $\mathbb{P}^{'} \in \mathcal{P}_H^\kappa(t^+,\mathbb{P})$ *such that* $\forall u > t$,

$$\mathbb{E}_t^{\mathbb{P}^{'}}\left[(K_u - K_t)^2\right] = \max\left\{\mathbb{E}_t^{\mathbb{P}_1}\left[(K_u - K_t)^2\right], \mathbb{E}_t^{\mathbb{P}_2}\left[(K_u - K_t)^2\right]\right\}. \tag{A.1}$$

Proof.
We define the following $\mathcal{F}_t$-measurable sets

$$E_1 := \left\{\omega \in \Omega \,:\, \mathbb{E}_t^{\mathbb{P}_2}\left[(K_u - K_t)^2\right](\omega) \leq \mathbb{E}_t^{\mathbb{P}_1}\left[(K_u - K_t)^2\right](\omega)\right\},$$

and $E_2 := \Omega \backslash E_1$. Then for all $A \in \mathcal{F}_T$, we define the probability measure $\mathbb{P}^{'}$ by,

$$\mathbb{P}^{'}(A) := \mathbb{P}_1(A \cap E_1) + \mathbb{P}_2(A \cap E_2).$$

By definition, $\mathbb{P}^{'}$ satisfies (A.1). Let us prove now that $\mathbb{P}^{'} \in \mathcal{P}_H^\kappa(t^+,\mathbb{P})$. As in the proof of claim (4.17) in [37], for $s \in [0,T]$, we define the processes α^* and ν^* as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha_s^*(\omega) &:= \alpha_s(\omega)\mathbf{1}_{[0,t)}(s) + \left(\alpha_s^1(\omega)\mathbf{1}_{\{X^\alpha \in E_1\}}(\omega) + \alpha_s^2(\omega)\mathbf{1}_{\{X^\alpha \in E_2\}}(\omega)\right)\mathbf{1}_{[t,T]}(s),\\
\nu_s^*(\omega) &:= \nu_s(\omega)\mathbf{1}_{[0,t)}(s) + \left(\nu_s^1(\omega)\mathbf{1}_{\{X^\alpha \in E_1\}}(\omega) + \nu_s^2(\omega)\mathbf{1}_{\{X^\alpha \in E_2\}}(\omega)\right)\mathbf{1}_{[t,T]}(s),
\end{aligned}$$

where X^α is defined in (2.6). We have

$$0 < \underline{\alpha} \wedge \underline{\alpha}^1 \wedge \underline{\alpha}^2 \leq \alpha^* \leq \overline{\alpha} \vee \overline{\alpha}^1 \vee \overline{\alpha}^2,$$

where $\underline{\alpha}$, $\overline{\alpha}$, $\underline{\alpha}^i$, $\overline{\alpha}^i$ are the lower and upper bounds of the processes α, α^1 and α^2. Next, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^T \int_E (1 \wedge |x|^2)\nu_s^*(ds,dx) \leq& \int_0^T \int_E (1 \wedge |x|^2)\nu_s(ds,dx) + \int_0^T \int_E (1 \wedge |x|^2)\nu_s^1(ds,dx)\\
&+ \int_0^T \int_E (1 \wedge |x|^2)\nu_s^2(ds,dx) < +\infty,
\end{aligned}$$

and the same way we see that $\int_0^T \int_{\{|x|>1\}} x\nu_s^*(ds,dx) < +\infty$. Then, we have therefore clearly $(\alpha^*,\nu^*) \in \tilde{\mathcal{A}}$, and we can define the element $\mathbb{P}^{\alpha^*,\nu^*}$ of $P_{\tilde{\mathcal{A}}}$.

Now using the same arguments as in the Step 3 of the proof of Lemma A.1 in [23], we obtain that for any $t_1 < \cdots < t_k = t < t_{k+1} < \cdots < t_n$ and any bounded and continuous functions ϕ and ψ,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^{\alpha^*,\nu^*}}\left[\phi(B_{t_1},\ldots,B_{t_k})\psi(B_{t_1},\ldots,B_{t_n})\right]\\
&= \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^{\alpha,\nu}}\Big[\phi(B_{t_1},\ldots,B_{t_k})\Big(\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^{\alpha_1,\nu_1}}[\psi(B_{t_1},\ldots,B_{t_k},B_t + B_{t_{k+1}}^t,\ldots,B_t + B_{t_n}^t)]\mathbf{1}_{E_1}\\
&\quad + \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}^{\alpha_2,\nu_2}}[\psi(B_{t_1},\ldots,B_{t_k},B_t + B_{t_{k+1}}^t,\ldots,B_t + B_{t_n}^t)]\mathbf{1}_{E_2}\Big)\Big].
\end{aligned}$$

This shows that

$$(\mathbb{P}^{\alpha^*,\nu^*})_t^\omega = (\mathbb{P}')_t^\omega \text{ for } \mathbb{P}^{\alpha^*,\nu^*}\text{-almost every } \omega \text{ in } \Omega \text{ and every } t > 0.$$

Thus $\mathbb{P}' = \mathbb{P}^{\alpha^*,\nu^*} \in \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{A}}}$. To prove that $\mathbb{P}' \in \mathcal{P}_H^\kappa$, we compute

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}'}\left[\int_0^T \left|\hat{F}_s^0\right|^2 ds\right] &= \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}\left[\int_0^t \left|\hat{F}_s^0\right|^2 ds\right] + \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}_1}\left[\int_t^T \left|\hat{F}_s^0\right|^2 ds\,\mathbf{1}_{E_1}\right] + \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}_2}\left[\int_t^T \left|\hat{F}_s^0\right|^2 ds\,\mathbf{1}_{E_2}\right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}\left[\int_0^T \left|\hat{F}_s^0\right|^2 ds\right] + \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}_1}\left[\int_0^T \left|\hat{F}_s^0\right|^2 ds\,\mathbf{1}_{E_1}\right] + \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}_2}\left[\int_0^T \left|\hat{F}_s^0\right|^2 ds\,\mathbf{1}_{E_2}\right] < +\infty.\end{aligned}$$

Since by construction $\mathbb{P}'$ coincides with $\mathbb{P}$ on $\mathcal{F}_t$, the proof is complete.

□

A.2 L^r-Integrability of exponential martingales

Lemma A.2. *Let $\delta > 0$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$. Then there exists a constant $C_{n,\delta}$ depending only on δ and n such that*

$$(1+x)^{-n} - 1 + nx \leq C_{n,\delta} x^2, \text{ for all } x \in [-1+\delta, +\infty).$$

Proof. The inequality is clear for x large enough, let's say $x \geq M$ for some $M > 0$. Then, a simple Taylor expansion shows that this also holds in a neighborhood of 0, that is to say for $x \in [-\varepsilon, \varepsilon]$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$. Finally, for $x \in (-1+\delta, -\varepsilon) \cup (\varepsilon, M)$, it is clear that we can choose C large enough such that the inequality also holds. □

Mémin [27] and then Lépingle and Mémin [26] proved some useful multiplicative decompositions of exponential semimartingales. We give here one of these representations that we will use in the proof of Lemma A.3.

Proposition A.1 (Proposition II.1 of [25])**.** *Let N be a local martingale and let A be a predictable process with finite variation such that $\Delta A \neq -1$. We assume $N_0 = A_0 = 0$. Then there exists a local martingale $\tilde{N}$ with $\tilde{N}_0 = 0$ and such that*

$$\mathcal{E}(N + A) = \mathcal{E}(\tilde{N})\mathcal{E}(A).$$

Lemma A.3. *Let $\lambda > 0$ and M be a local martingale with bounded jumps, such that $\Delta M \geq -1 + \delta$, for a fixed $\delta > 0$. Let $V^{-\lambda}$ be the predictable compensator of*

$$\left\{ W_t^{-\lambda} = \sum_{s \leq t} \left[(1 + \Delta M_s)^{-\lambda} - 1 + \lambda \Delta M_s \right],\ t \geq 0 \right\}.$$

We have

(i) $\mathcal{E}^{-\lambda}(M) = \mathcal{E}(N^{-\lambda} + A^{-\lambda})$ *where*

$$A^{-\lambda} = \frac{\lambda(\lambda+1)}{2} \langle M^c, M^c \rangle^T + V^{-\lambda},\ N^{-\lambda} = -\lambda M^T + W^{-\lambda} - V^{-\lambda}.$$

(ii) There exist a local martingale $\tilde{N}^{-\lambda}$ such that

$$\mathcal{E}^{-\lambda}(M) = \mathcal{E}(\tilde{N}^{-\lambda})\mathcal{E}(A^{-\lambda}).$$

Proof. First note that thanks to lemma A.2, for $\lambda > 0$, $(1+x)^{-\lambda} - 1 + \lambda x \leq Cx^2$, and thus $W^{-\lambda}$ is integrable. We set

$$T_n = \inf\{t \geq 0 \ : \ \mathcal{E}(M)_t \leq \frac{1}{n}\} \text{ and } M_t^n = M_{t \wedge T_n}.$$

Then M^n and $\mathcal{E}(M^n)$ are local martingales, $\mathcal{E}(M^n) \geq \frac{1}{n}$ and $\mathcal{E}(M^n)_t = \mathcal{E}(M)_t$ if $t < T_n$. The assumption $\Delta M > -1$ shows that T_n tends to infinity when n tends to infinity. For each $n \geq 1$, we apply It's formula to a $\mathcal{C}^2$ function f_n that coincides with $x^{-\lambda}$ on $[\frac{1}{n}, +\infty)$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{E}^{-\lambda}(M^n)_t =& 1 - \lambda \int_0^t \mathcal{E}^{-\lambda-1}(M^n)_{s^-} d\mathcal{E}(M^n)_s + \frac{\lambda(\lambda+1)}{2} \int_0^t \mathcal{E}^{-\lambda-2}(M^n)_{s^-} d\left\langle (\mathcal{E}(M^n))^c \right\rangle_s \\
&+ \sum_{s \leq t} \left[\mathcal{E}^{-\lambda}(M^n)_s - \mathcal{E}^{-\lambda}(M^n)_{s^-} + \lambda \mathcal{E}^{-\lambda-1}(M^n)_{s^-} \Delta \mathcal{E}^{-\lambda}(M^n)_s \right] \\
=& 1 + \int_0^t \mathcal{E}(M^n)_{s^-} dX_s^n,
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$X_t^n := -\lambda M_t^n + \frac{\lambda(\lambda+1)}{2} \left\langle (M^n)^c, (M^n)^c \right\rangle_t + \sum_{s \leq t} \left[(1 + \Delta M_s)^{-\lambda} - 1 + \lambda \Delta M_s \right],$$

and then $\mathcal{E}^{-\lambda}(M^n) = \mathcal{E}(X^n)$. Let us define the non-truncated counterpart X of X^n:

$$X = -\lambda M + \frac{\lambda(\lambda+1)}{2} \left\langle M^c, M^c \right\rangle + W^{-\lambda}.$$

On the interval $[0, T_n[$, we have $X^n = X$ and $\mathcal{E}^{-\lambda}(M) = \mathcal{E}(X)$, now letting n tends to infinity, we obtain that $\mathcal{E}^{-\lambda}(M)$ and $\mathcal{E}(X)$ coincide on $[0, +\infty[$, which is the point (i) of the Lemma.

We want to use the proposition A.1 to prove the point (ii), so we need to show that $\Delta A > -1$. We set

$$S = \inf\{t \geq 0 \ : \ \Delta A_t^{-\lambda} \leq -1\}.$$

It is a predictable time. Using this, and the fact that M and $(W^{-\lambda} - V^{-\lambda})$ are local martingales, we have

$$\Delta A_S^{-\lambda} = \mathbb{E}\left[\Delta A_S^{-\lambda} | \mathcal{F}_{S-} \right] = \mathbb{E}\left[\Delta X_S | \mathcal{F}_{S-} \right] = \mathbb{E}\left[(1 + \Delta M_S)^{-\lambda} | \mathcal{F}_{S-} \right],$$

and since $\{S < +\infty\} \in \mathcal{F}_{S-}$,

$$0 \geq \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbf{1}_{\{S<+\infty\}} (1 + \Delta A_S^{-\lambda}) \right] = \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbf{1}_{\{S<+\infty\}} (1 + \Delta M_S)^{-\lambda} \right].$$

Then $\Delta M_S \leq -1$ on $\{S < +\infty\}$, which means that $S = +\infty$ and $\Delta A > -1$ a.s. The proof is now complete. □

We are finally in a position to state the Lemma on L^r integrability of exponential martingales for a negative exponent r.

Lemma A.4. *Let $\lambda > 0$ and let M be a local martingale with bounded jumps, such that $\Delta M \geq -1 + \delta$, for a fixed $\delta > 0$, and $\langle M, M \rangle_t$ is bounded $dt \times \mathbb{P}$-a.s. Then*

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}} \left[\mathcal{E}(M)_t^{-\lambda} \right] < +\infty \;\; dt \times \mathbb{P} - a.s.$$

Proof. Let $n \geq 1$ be an integer. We will denote $\tilde{\mu}_M = \mu_M - \nu_M$ the compensated jump measure of M. Thanks to lemma A.3, we write the decompostion

$$\mathcal{E}(M)^{-n} = \mathcal{E}(\tilde{N}^{-n}) \mathcal{E} \left(\frac{1}{2} n(n+1) < M^c, M^c > + V^{-n} \right),$$

where $\tilde{N}^{-n}$ is a local martingale and V^{-n} is defined as $V^{-\lambda}$. Using Lemma A.2, we have the inequality

$$V_t^{-n} \leq \int_0^t \int_E C x^2 \nu_M(ds, dx)$$

and using the previous representation we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}(M)_t^{-n} &\leq \mathcal{E}(\tilde{N}^{-n})_t \mathcal{E} \left(\frac{1}{2} n(n+1) \langle M^c, M^c \rangle + \int_0^{\cdot} \int_E C x^2 \nu_M(ds, dx) \right)_t \\ &\leq \mathcal{E}(\tilde{N}^{-n})_t \exp \left((\frac{1}{2} n(n+1) + C) \langle M, M \rangle_t \right) \\ &\leq C \mathcal{E}(\tilde{N}^{-n})_t \text{ since } \langle M, M \rangle_t \text{ is bounded.} \end{aligned}$$

Let us prove now that the jumps of $\tilde{N}^{-n}$ are strictly bigger than -1. We compute

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta \tilde{N}^{-n} &= \frac{\Delta N^{-n}}{1 + \Delta A^{-n}} \text{ where } A^{-n} \text{ is defined as in lemma A.4} \\ &= \frac{(1 + \Delta M)^{-n}}{1 + \Delta V^{-n}} - 1 > -1 \text{ since } -1 < \Delta M \leq B \text{ and } \Delta V^{-n} > -1. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that $\mathcal{E}(\tilde{N}^{-n})$ is a positive supermartingale which equals 1 at $t = 0$. We deduce

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\mathcal{E}(M)_t^{-n} \right] \leq C \mathbb{E} \left[\mathcal{E}(\tilde{N}^{-n})_t \right] \leq C.$$

We have the desired integrability for negative integers. We extend the property to any negative real number by Hölder's inequality. □

References

[1] Avellaneda, M., Lévy, A., Paras, A. (1995). Pricing and hedging derivative securities in markets with uncertain volatilities, *Applied Math. Finance*, 2:73–88.

[2] Barles, G., Buckdahn, R., Pardoux, E. (1997). Backward stochastic differential equations and integral-partial differential equations, *Stochastics and stochastic reports*, 60:57–83.

[3] Becherer, D. (2006). Bounded solutions to backward SDEs with jumps for utility optimization and indifference hedging, *Ann. of App. Prob*, 16(4):2027–2054.

[4] Bichteler, K. (1981). Stochastic integration and L^p theory of semimartingales, *Ann. of Prob.*, 9(1):49–89.

[5] Billingsley, P. (1995). Probability and Measure, 3rd Edition, *Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics*.

[6] Bion-Nadal J., Kervarec M. (2011). Risk measuring under model uncertainty. *Ann. Appl. Proba.*, to appear.

[7] Bismut, J.M. (1973). Conjugate convex functions in optimal stochastic control, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 44:384–404.

[8] Bouchard, B., Touzi, N. (2011). Weak Dynamic Programming Principle for Viscosity Solutions, *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 49(3):948–962.

[9] Cheridito, P., Soner, H.M., Touzi, N., and Victoir, N. (2007). Second Order Backward Stochastic Differential Equations and Fully Non-Linear Parabolic PDEs, *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 60(7):1081–1110.

[10] Cohen, S.N. (2011) Quasi-sure analysis, aggregation and dual representations of sublinear expectations in general spaces , preprint.

[11] Crépey, S., Matoussi, A. (2008). Reflected and doubly reflected BSDEs with jumps, *Ann. of App. Prob.*, 18(5):2041–2069.

[12] Denis, L., Martini, C. (2006). A theoretical framework for the pricing of contingent claims in the presence of model uncertainty, *Annals of Applied Probability*, 16(2): 827–852.

[13] Denis, L., Hu, M., Peng, S. (2010). Function spaces and capacity related to a Sublinear Expectation: application to G-Brownian Motion Paths, preprint.

[14] El Karoui, N., Nguyen, D.H., Jeanblanc-Picqué, M. (1987). Compactification methods in the control of degenerate diffusions: existence of an optimal control, *Stochastics*, 20:169–219.

[15] El Karoui, N., Peng, S., Quenez, M.C. (1994). Backward stochastic differential equations in finance, *Mathematical Finance*, 7(1):1–71.

[16] El Karoui, N. (1981). Les aspects probalilistes du contrôle stochastique, *Ecole d'Eté de Probabilités de Saint-Flour IX-1979, Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, 876:73–238.

[17] El Karoui, N., Kapoudjian, C., Pardoux, E., Peng, S. and Quenez, M. C. (1997). Reflected solutions of backward SDE's, and related obstacle problems for PDE's,*Annals of Applied Probability*, 25(2): 702–737.

[18] Hu, M. and Peng, S. (2009). G-Lèvy processes under sublinear expectations, preprint.

[19] Jacod, J., Shiryaev, A.N. (1987). Limit theorems for stochastic processes, *Springer-Verlag.*

[20] Karandikar, R. (1995). On pathwise stochastic integration. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 57:11–18.

[21] Kazamaki, N. (1979). A sufficient condition for the uniform integrability of exponential martingales, *Math. Rep. Toyama University*, 2:1–11.

[22] Kazamaki, N. (1994). Continuous exponential martingales and BMO. *Springer-Verlag.*

[23] Kazi-Tani, N., Possamai, D., Zhou, C. (2012). Second order BSDEs with jumps, part II: existence and applications, preprint.

[24] Kazi-Tani, N., Possamai, D., Zhou, C. (2012). Second order BSDEs with jumps, part III: connection with fully nonlinear PIDEs, in preparation.

[25] Lépingle, D. and Mémin, J. (1978). Sur l'intégrabilité uniforme des martingales exponentielles. Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie verw. Gebiete 42:175–203.

[26] Lépingle, D. and Mémin, J. (1978). Intégrabilité uniforme et dans L^r des martingales exponentielles. Sém. Prob. de Rennes.

[27] Mémin, J. (1978). Décompositions multiplicatives de semimartingales exponentielles et applications, *Séminaire de probabilités de Strasbourg*, 12:35–46.

[28] Morlais, M.-A. (2009). Utility maximization in a jump market model, *Stochastics and Stochastics Reports*, 81:1–27.

[29] Neveu, J. (1975). Discrete parameter martingales, *North Holland Publishing Company.*

[30] Nutz, M. (2011). Pathwise construction of stochastic integrals, preprint.

[31] Pardoux, E. and Peng, S (1990). Adapted solution of a backward stochastic differential equation, *Systems Control Lett.*, 14:55–61.

[32] Peng, S. (2007) G-Expectation, G-Brownian motion, and related stochastic calculus of Itô type, preprint.

[33] Peng, S. (2010) Nonlinear Expectations and Stochastic Calculus under Uncertainty, preprint.

[34] Possamai, D., Zhou, C. (2010). Second order backward stochastic differential equations with quadratic growth, preprint.

[35] Royer, M. (2006). Backward stochastic differential equations with jumps and related non-linear expectations, *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 116:1358–1376.

[36] Sato, K.-I. (1999). Lévy processes and infinitely divisible distributions, *Cambridge University Press.*

[37] Soner, H.M., Touzi, N., Zhang J. (2010). Wellposedness of second order BSDE's, *Prob. Th. and Related Fields*, to appear.

[38] Soner, H.M., Touzi, N., Zhang J. (2010). Dual formulation of second order target problems, *Ann. of App. Prob*, to appear.

[39] Soner, H.M., Touzi, N., Zhang J. (2010). Quasi-sure stochastic analysis through aggregation, *Elec. Journal of Prob.*, to appear.

[40] Tang S., Li X.(1994). Necessary condition for optimal control of stochastic systems with random jumps, *SIAM JCO*, 332:1447–1475.